

JOHANNES BRONKHORST

ON THE HISTORY OF PĀṆINIAN GRAMMAR IN THE EARLY CENTURIES FOLLOWING PATAÑJALI

(Published in: *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 11 (1983), pp. 357-412)

I

1.1. Vt. 15 to P. 3.1.87 reads: *sr̥jiyujoh śyaṃstu*. Patañjali explains (Mbh. II, p. 69, 1.15-16): *sr̥jiyujyoh sakarmakayoh kartā bahulaṃ karmavad bhavatīti vaktavyam / śyaṃstu bhavati* / “It must be stated that the agent of [the roots] *sr̥j* and *yuj*, when they have an object (*karman*), is often like the object. But [the *vikaraṇa*] is [not *yaK*, but] *ŚyaN*.” The effect of the agent’s being like the object is that, instead of active endings, the verb will take passive endings, i.e., *yaK* (P. 3.1.67), Ātmanepada (P. 1.3.13), *CiN* (P. 3.1.66). The present *vārttika* prescribes *ŚyaN* instead of *yaK*, which results in a different accent (P. 6.1.197), but Ātmanepada and *CiN* remain. The examples in the Bhāṣya illustrating this *vārttika* are: *sr̥jyate mālām* and *asar̥ji mālām* for *sr̥j*; *yujyate brahmacārī yogam* for *yuj* (Mbh. II, p. 69, 1.16-18).

It is clear that the first and the last of these three examples would be accounted for by an occurrence of *yuj* and *sr̥j* in the fourth gaṇa (*divādī*) of the Dhātupāṭha. The present stem of the roots of this gaṇa takes the *vikaraṇa* *ŚyaN* (P. 3.1.69). An anudatta vowel added as a marker would bring about Ātmanepada endings by P. 1.3.12. It is, however, equally clear that the *vārttika* and the Bhāṣya discussed above show that *yuj* and *sr̥j* were not found in the fourth gaṇa of the Dhātupāṭha at that time.

But they are found in the fourth gaṇa of all versions of the Dhātupāṭha that have come down to us, Pāṇinian and non-Pāṇinian (Palsule, 1955: 110, 150)! The root *yuj* occurs thrice in the Pāṇinian Dhātupāṭha: IV.68 *yujA samādhau*; VII.7 *yujîR yoge*; X.264 *yujA saṃyamane*; the root *sr̥j* twice: IV.69 *sr̥jA visarge*; VI.121 *sr̥jā visarge*. Both roots are represented in the fourth gaṇa.

1.2. We must conclude that *yuj* and *sr̥j* were added to the fourth gaṇa of the Dhātupāṭha after Patañjali. The fact that the two roots occur brotherly together in the fourth gaṇa (IV.68 and 69) also shows that they were added under the influence of the *vārttika* and Bhāṣya discussed above. Phrases [358] like *yujyate yogam* and *sr̥jyate mālām* do not seem to occur anywhere in Sanskrit literature except the Mahābhāṣya.

It is not possible to assume that Patañjali (or even Kātyāyana) added *yuj* and *sr̥j* to the fourth gaṇa of the Dhātupāṭha. Addition of these two roots to the fourth gaṇa is not even

recommended in the Bhāṣya.¹ Moreover, even after *yuj* and *srj* had found a place in the fourth gaṇa, a special statement would remain necessary to make affixing of *CiN* possible (in *asarji*); without such a statement the modified Dhātupāṭha would not make the Bhāṣya which is at the base of the modification completely superfluous.

1.3. Who then made this change in the Dhātupāṭha? Obviously someone who wanted to improve upon Pāṇini's grammar. Our thoughts go to the makers of new grammars after Pāṇini. The earliest whose Dhātupāṭha is preserved is Candra/Candragomin.²

The Cāndra Dhātupāṭha does indeed contain the two roots *yuj* and *srj* together in the fourth gaṇa: CDhp. IV.114 and 115. There is however reason to believe that Candra was not the first to put them there:

In Candra's grammar no special rules should be needed to account for *yujyate* (*brahmacārī yogam*) and *srjyate* (*mālām*). The presence of *yuj* and *srj* in the fourth gaṇa of its Dhātupāṭha should suffice. There is, indeed, no rule for the formation of *yujyate*. For the formation of *srjyate* (*mālām*), on the other hand, there are two rules, C. 1.4.103-04. These rules read:

C. 1.3.103: *srjah śrāddhe* “[Ātmanepada endings come] after *srj* when it concerns a faithful [person].”

C. 1.4.104: *śe śyan* “[Under the same circumstances,] in [the tenses and moods where the *vikaraṇa*] *Śa* [should be used] *ŚyaN* [is used].”

Śa is the *vikaraṇa* of the sixth (*rudhādī*) gaṇa, also in Candra's grammar. The above sūtras therefore *presuppose* that *srj* occurs in the sixth gaṇa of the Cāndra Dhātupāṭha, but not in the fourth! As it is, *srj* occurs in both (CDhp. IV.115 and VI.110).

It is not possible to assume that *srj* was added to the fourth gaṇa of the Cāndra Dhātupāṭha by a later hand. There would be no need for that on account of C. 1.4.103-104. It is, on the other hand, understandable why Candra should have composed the rules C. 1.4.103-104 (and 105: see below) even if he had *srj* already in the fourth gaṇa of his Dhātupāṭha. The reason [359] would be that the presence of *srj* in the fourth gaṇa accounts for the *form* *srjyate*, but says nothing about the special *meaning* which this expression conveys. Immediately following the Bhāṣya passage which we studied in § 1.1, Patañjali says (Mbh. II, p. 69, l. 16): *srjeḥ śrāddhopapanne kartari karmavadbhāvo vācyaś ciṇātmanepadārthaḥ* “When the agent of [the root] *srj* is endowed with faith, it must be stated that [he] is like the object, for the sake of *CiN* and Ātmanepada.” We see that Candra took care that the expression *srjyate* would convey the meaning intended by Patañjali.

¹ Some such recommendations are made with respect to the Gaṇapāṭha. See § 3, below.

² Thieme (1932: 239-40 (526)) and Palsule (1961: 38-41, 49-51) have made it probable that the Kātantra Dhātupāṭha preserved in Tibetan (ed. Liebich, 1930: 216-32) is a late composition and that the Kātantra grammar made use of and was based on the Pāṇinian Dhātupāṭha. Another Kātantra Dhātupāṭha may have been composed by Durgasiṃha on the model of the Cāndra Dhātupāṭha (Palsule, 1961: 49-52).

Candra's concern with Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* becomes even clearer in the immediately following sūtra, C. 1.4.105. We know that the presence of *srj* in the fourth gaṇa cannot account for *asarji* (*mālām*), one of the examples given by Patañjali. This sūtra makes up for that:

C. 1.4.105: *luṇi te cin* “When *IUN* [in the form] *ta* follows, *CiN* [comes after *srj* when the agent is a faithful person].”

It is of some importance to note that Candra's grammar throughout adheres to Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya*, and can indeed be described as “embodying all the suggestions and corrections of Kātyāyana and Patañjali” (Chatterji, 1953: v). We shall meet with further instances illustrating this as we proceed, and shall be able to base some valuable inferences on a few oversights on the part of Candra.

1.4. It is reasonable to conclude that Candra composed his Dhātupāṭha on the basis of another one which already contained *srj*, and *yuj* as well, in the fourth gaṇa. This conclusion is only possible if we assume that Candra was somewhat careless with respect to his Dhātupāṭha (which should be without *srj*). There is some independent evidence in support of this.

On a number of occasions Candra mentions verbal roots in his sūtras which do not occur in his Dhātupāṭha: *stambhU*, *stumbhU*, *skambhU*,³ *skumbhU* in C. 1.1.99; *sātI* in C. 1.1.144; *ṛt* in C. 1.1.48; *ju* in C. 1.2.99 (and in the Vṛtti⁴ on C. 1.2.103). This would obviously not have been possible without at least some amount of carelessness on the part of Candra with regard to his Dhātupāṭha.

1.5. At this point a small excursus will prove valuable. With regard to all the roots enumerated above — which are present in Candra's sūtras but not in his Dhātupāṭha —, the *Kāśikā* says, under the corresponding Pāṇinian sūtras [360] (3.1.82; 138; 29 and 3.2.150 (& 156) respectively), that they are *sautra dhātu*, roots only occurring in the sūtras, not in the Dhātupāṭha. This shows that the authors of the *Kāśikā* did not feel at liberty to make changes in the Dhātupāṭha. Rather, they looked upon it as an unchangeable part of Pāṇini's grammar. This is shown again by a remark in the *Kāśikā* on P. 7.3.34. Here the question is raised about how the forms *udyama* and *uparama* are to be justified. The reply is: they are explicitly mentioned in *aḍa udyame* (Dhp. I.380) and *yama uparama* (Dhp. I.1033) respectively (*katham udyamoparamau? aḍa udyame, yama uparama iti nipātanād anugantavyau*). The whole of the

³ *ṣtabhI*, *stabhI* and *skabhI* occur in the Candra Dhātupāṭha. That these roots must be distinguished from *stambhU* and *skambhU*, follows from the fact that the marker *U* plays a role in certain derivations (C. 5.4.117). Note further the presence in Candra's Dhātupāṭha of roots like *śranbhU* (I.415), *ancU* (I.590), and pairs like *luṭI* (I.111) and *luṭA* (X.18), *śrathI* (I.330) and *śranthA* (IX.30).

⁴ The evidence collected by Birwé (1968) supports the view that Candra himself wrote the Vṛtti; cf. Scharfe, 1977: 164-65.

Dhātupāṭha, including the meaning entries, was apparently considered by the authors of the *Kāśīkā* as Pāṇini's own word, in which no alterations should be made (cf. Bronkhorst, 1981b: § 5.3).

1.6. There is another argument against the assumption that Candra was the first who inserted *yuj* and *srj* into the fourth gaṇa of the Dhātupāṭha. The question it would leave unanswered is why the Pāṇinīyas should have taken into their own Dhātupāṭha these two roots from Candra's. There can be no doubt that the later Pāṇinīyas did not borrow their Dhātupāṭha from Candra. This follows from the fact that the first two roots of the Pāṇinian Dhātupāṭha are *bhū*, *edh*. This was already the case in the time of Patañjali (see Mbh. I, p. 254, l. 12). The first two roots of the Cāndra Dhātupāṭha, on the other hand, are *bhū*, *cit*.

This argument cannot be used, at any rate not with the same force, against the assumption that the author of the earlier Kātantra grammar inserted *yuj* and *srj* into the fourth gaṇa. That is to say, it cannot be used if we believe, with Thieme (1932: 239-40 (526)) and Palsule (1961: 49-51), that the Kātantra grammar made use of the Pāṇinian Dhātupāṭha. The Kātantra, moreover, shows signs of being acquainted with Kātyāyana's vārttikas and Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* (Thieme, 1932: 239 (526)), so that there was a reason to add *yuj* and *srj* to the fourth gaṇa.

None the less, it is hard to believe that the author of the Kātantra added *yuj* and *srj* to the fourth gaṇa. The Kātantra is an elementary grammar which does not aim at the completeness and sophistication of Pāṇini's grammar. It is hardly probable that its author took the trouble of revising the Dhātupāṭha in order to account for such unusual phrases as *yujyate brahmacārī yogam* and *srjyate mālām*.

[361]

This same difficulty attaches to the Kaumāralāta, which the Kātantra appears to be a revision of (Lüders, 1930: 716 f.). It is hard to believe that its author Kumāralāta brought about the changes in the Dhātupāṭha which we are investigating.

1.7. The above considerations drive us to the one remaining option: In the time preceding Candra grammarians of the Pāṇinian tradition were working to perfect Pāṇini's grammar. These grammarians knew Kātyāyana's vārttikas and Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* but rather than studying these works in their own right, they continued the work begun by these two authors. Where Kātyāyana and Patañjali noted that Pāṇini's grammar failed to generate *yujyate* (*brahmacārī yogam*) and *srjyate* (*mālām*), our anonymous grammarians made such changes in the Dhātupāṭha so that Pāṇini's grammar was able to generate these forms. It seems further that they did not follow Kātyāyana and Patañjali slavishly, for the changes introduced in the Dhātupāṭha do not account for *asarji* (*mālām*), also mentioned in the *Mahābhāṣya*. With

respect to this last point, however, we must be careful: we do not know if our grammarians had not made changes in other parts of the grammar to account for *asarji*.

1.8. We insert here a second excursus. The chapter on Patañjali's philosophy in Sāyaṇamādhava's *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* contains a passage which is of interest to us for two different reasons. It reads (p. 346, 1.147 - p. 347, 1.165):

*nanu yujir yoga iti saṃyogārthatayā paripāṭhitād yujer niṣpanno yogaśabdaḥ
saṃyogavacana eva syān na tu nirodhavacanah/ .../ tad etad vārtam/ .../ dhātūnām
anekārthatvena yujeḥ samādhyaarthatvopapatte[ḥ].../ ata eva kecana yujiṃ samādhāv
api paṭhanti yuja samādhāv iti/*

“Objection: The word ‘Yoga’, since it is derived from [the root] *yuj* which is enumerated in the sense ‘conjunction’ (*saṃyoga*) in [Dhp. VII.7] *yujir yoge* ‘*yujIR* in [the sense] “junction”’ should be only expressive of [the sense] ‘conjunction’, but not [should it be] expressive of [the sense] ‘destruction’ (*nirodha*). ... [Reply:] This [statement] is worthless. ... Because [the root] *yuj* can have the sense ‘mental absorption’ (*samādhī*) on account of the fact that roots have many senses. ... For this very reason some read [the root] *yuj* also in [the sense] ‘mental absorption’, thus: *yujA samādhau*.”

[362]

1.8.1. The first thing to be noted is that according to Sāyaṇamādhava only *some* read the entry *yujA samādhau* in their Dhātupāṭha. This is the entry which was added to the fourth gaṇa some time after Patañjali and before Candra. The problem is that this entry occurs in the fourth gaṇa of all Sanskrit Dhātupāṭhas which have come down to us, Pāṇinian and non-Pāṇinian. Do we have to believe that Sāyaṇamādhava still knew versions of the Dhātupāṭha without this entry?

A more plausible explanation of Sāyaṇamādhava's remark is possible. For this purpose a few words must be said about the relationship between the author of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*, and Sāyaṇa, son of Māyaṇa, the author of the *Mādhavīyā Dhātuvṛtti*, the most extensive and informative commentary on the Pāṇinian Dhātupāṭha ever written (as far as we can tell). With regard to this, two points of view are possible; it seems that the weight of evidence slightly favours the second. Narasimhachar (1916: 20) has argued that the author of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* (Mādhava, son of Sāyaṇa) was the son of the author of the *Mādhavīyā Dhātuvṛtti*. Anantalal Thakur, on the other hand, has produced evidence that the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* was composed by someone called ‘Cannibhaṭṭa’, who must have been the son of Sāyaṇa's preceptor (Thakur, 1961: 524-25). Either way, the author of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* was closely acquainted with the author of the *Mādhavīyā Dhātuvṛtti*.

Well, the *Mādhavīyā Dhātuvṛtti* has this to say about the entry *yujA samādhau* (p. 426):

*samādhīś cittanīrodhaḥ, tenāyam akarmakaḥ/ ... yujyate brahmacārī yogam ity etad
api ‘sṛjyuyjoś śyaṃstu’ iti sakarmakasya kartuḥ karmavadbhāvaśyanor vidhānād
yujyate/*

“Mental absorption (*samādhī*) is destruction [of the fluctuations] of the mind, therefore this [root *yuj*] is intransitive. ... Also the [expression] *yujyate brahmacārī*

yogam is proper, because in [vt. 15 to P. 3.1.87] *sr̥jiyujyoś śyamstu* it has been prescribed that the agent of the transitive [root *yuj*] is like the object, [and also] *ŚyaN* [has there been prescribed].”

No mention is made of other Dhātupāṭhas which are without the entry *yujA samādhau*. But quite clearly it did not escape Sāyaṇa’s attention that this entry made the vārttika quoted partially superfluous. It is true that the [363] difficulty is explained away. But it is impossible to believe that Sāyaṇa — who so often makes mention of the differences between the versions of the Dhātupāṭha — had not considered the possibility that the entry *yujA samādhau* was an addition to the Dhātupāṭha. Indeed, the statement in the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* which is under discussion, may ultimately be the expression of a suspicion, or even of a privately held belief, of Sāyaṇa the author of the *Mādhavīyā Dhātuvṛtti*.

One more circumstance strengthens this supposition. The *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*, in the passage which we are studying, presupposes the identity of *samādhi* (mental absorption) and *nirodha* (destruction [of the fluctuations of the mind]), as if that were a matter of course. This identification is explicitly made in the passage from the *Mādhavīyā Dhātuvṛtti* quoted above. It is clear that this identification was made under the influence of the *Yogabhāṣya*: on sūtra 1.1 the *Yogabhāṣya* identifies Yoga and mental absorption (p. 1: *yogaḥ samādhiḥ*), while sūtra 1.2 identifies Yoga and destruction of the fluctuations of the mind (p. 9: *yogaś cittavṛttinirodhaḥ*). But the direct identification *samādhi* = *nirodha* is extremely rare, if at all it occurs anywhere else besides the *Mādhavīyā Dhātuvṛtti*.

We conclude that, even if we can not altogether discard the possibility that the author of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* knew a Dhātupāṭha without *yujA samādhau*, it is more likely that he was aware of the superfluity of this entry in the fourth gaṇa, possibly under the influence of Sāyaṇa the author of the *Mādhavīyā Dhātuvṛtti*. The statement that only some have this entry, in other words, that this entry is not original, may have been based on inference rather than on acquaintance with a Dhātupāṭha without it.

1.8.2. Sāyaṇamādhava (as we shall continue to call the author of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*) also maintains that the entry *yujA samādhau* made its appearance in the Dhātupāṭha because ‘Yoga’ already meant ‘mental absorption’ (*samādhi*). It seems, however, more likely that in reality the reverse process took place: ‘Yoga’ became, for certain authors, synonymous with *samādhi* as a result of the existence of the entry *yujA samādhau* in the Dhātupāṭha.

Not until the later Upaniṣads does the word ‘Yoga’ refer to the set of spiritual practices among which ‘mental absorption’ plays an important role⁵ (Garbe, 1896: 35; Deussen, 1920: 345). There is no reason to doubt that this sense of the word was no more than a specialization

⁵ There is no reason to think that *yoga* in the Taittirīya Up. 2.4 has the sense here under discussion.

of its more general [364] sense ‘disciplined activity, earnest striving’, which seems to be “the common denominator of all the epic definitions of Yoga” (Edgerton, 1924: 38).

The fact that the entry *yujA samādhau* was added to the Dhātupāṭha, does not necessarily mean that the word ‘Yoga’ had accepted a new meaning. Meaning entries in the Dhātupāṭha, Kaiyaṭa observed, are illustrative (Bronkhorst, 1981b: § 5.1) and do not necessarily exhaust the whole range of meanings of the roots. Certainly mental absorptions (*samādhi*) belonged to the spiritual practices covered by the word ‘Yoga’ (see, e.g., Maitrāyaṇīya Up. 6.18) even if it did not exhaust the latter’s meaning.

The situation changed, possibly under the influence of *yujA samādhau* in the Dhātupāṭha. The author of the *Yogabhāṣya* identified Yoga and *samādhi*⁶ (above, § 1.8.1). This was taken over in the *Mādhavīyā Dhātuvṛtti* and the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*, as we saw above (§ 1.8.1). The same identification is found in other schools of thought. Aparārkadeva’s *Nyāyamuktāvalī*, a commentary on Bhāsarvajña’s *Nyāyasāra*, gives as the opinion of “the teachers” that mental absorption is the most perfect Yoga (part 2, p. 145, l. 19-20: *samādhir evātyantaprakarṣaṃ gato yoga ity ācāryāḥ*). Kaundinya’s *Pañcārthabhāṣya*, a Pāśupata work, speaks about “Yoga characterized by mental absorption” (p. 6, l. 13: *samādhilakṣaṇe yoge*). The *Jainendra Siddhānta Kośa* (IV, p. 338, s.v. *samādhi*) gives a quotation from a Jaina work, the *Rājavārtika*, which refers to the Dhātupāṭha: *yujeh samādhivacanasya yogaḥ samādhī dhyānam ity anarthāntaram*. And Pūjyapāda’s *Sarvāthasiddhi* identifies Yoga and *samādhi* while commenting on sūtra 6.12 of the *Tattvārtha Sūtra* (p. 248).

1.9. Another change introduced into the Dhātupāṭha is pointed out in the *Kāśikā* on P. 7.4.3. This sūtra (*bhrājabhāsabhāṣadīpajīvamīlapīḍām anyatarasyām*; it is commented upon in the *Mahābhāṣya*) prescribes optional shortening of the penultimate long vowel of a number of roots — among them *bhrāj* and *bhās* — before *Ṇi-CaṆ*. The preceding rule P. 7.4.2 (*nāglopiśāsṛditām*) prohibits such shortening in roots which have a marker *Ṛ*. Well, both *bhrāj* and *bhās* have a marker *Ṛ* in the Dhātupāṭha (Dhp. I.194: *bhrājṚ dīptau*; I.875: *ṬUbhrājṚ dīptau*; I.655: *bhāsṚ dīptau*). The *Kāśikā* rightly remarks (II, p. 860): *bhrājabhāsor ṛditkaraṇam apāṇinīyam*.

The *Cāndra-Vyākaraṇa* contains the same inconsistency. C. 6.1.62-63 are virtually identical with P. 7.4.2-3; CDhp. I.364, 558, 456 are essentially identical with Dhp. I.194, 875, 655. Already Candra observed the superfluity [365] of the marker *Ṛ* in *bhrājṚ* and *bhāsṚ* (Vṛtti on C. 6.1.63: *bhrājabhāsor ṛdupalakṣaṇatvaṃ hrasvatvapratīṣedhārtham anarthakam*). This shows that this change was introduced before Candra.

⁶ Aśvaghoṣa, in his *Saundarananda* XVI.33, seems to identify Yoga with *smṛti* and *samādhi* combined. This verse reads: *nyāyena satyābhigamāya* (so Johnston, 1932: 92 n. 33, and ed. Haraprasad Shastri, p. 103) *yuktā samyak smṛtiḥ samyag atho samādhīḥ/ idaṃ dvayaṃ yogavidhau pravṛttaṃ samāśrayaṃ cittaparigrahāya//* “Right attention used in accordance with the plan in order to approach the Truths and right concentration of thought, these two, based on tranquillity, should be practised in the department of Yoga for the mastery of the mind” (tr. Johnston, 1932: 92). See also *Saundarananda* XVII.4.

II

2. We have seen (§ 1.5) that the authors of the *Kāśikā* did not feel free to make changes in the Dhātupāṭha as it had come down to them, that they looked upon it as the work of Pāṇini. We may expect that they looked upon the Sūtrapāṭha and Gaṇapāṭha in the same way. Unlike the Dhātupāṭha, the Sūtrapāṭha and Gaṇapāṭha are completely contained in the *Kāśikā*. Respect for their form may have preserved features introduced into them in the time before Candra. We shall therefore compare the Sūtra- and Gaṇapāṭha as they are known from the *Kāśikā* and from the *Mahābhāṣya*. We shall start with the Sūtrapāṭha (remainder of § 2), and then turn to the Gaṇapāṭha (§ 3). Kielhorn (1887: 184 (232)) has shown that in the case of 58 rules the text of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* given in the *Kāśikā* differs from the text known to Kātyāyana and Patañjali.

2.1. The authors of the *Kāśikā* did not themselves change the sūtras of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. This is confirmed by the circumstance that the changes are not always in full agreement with the opinions of the authors of the *Kāśikā*:

2.1.1. P. 1.3.29 reads, in the *Kāśikā*: *samo gamyṛcchipracchisvaratyartiśruvidibhyaḥ*. The original reading must have been: *samo gamyṛcchibhyām* (Kielhorn, 1887: 181 (229)); the roots *vidipracchisvarati* and *artiśru* were added in accordance with vt. 1 and 2 to this rule (Mbh. I, p. 282, l. 11 and 14). But vt. 2 also prescribes that *ḍṛś* must be added. This root is not present in the sūtra as the *Kāśikā* has it. The reason is *not* that the authors of the *Kāśikā* held an opinion different from Kātyāyana's, for the *Kāśikā* contains, in the commentary, a special prescription to include *ḍṛś*.

2.1.2. P. 3.1.126 reads, in the *Kāśikā*: *āsuyuvapirapilapitrapicamaś ca*. As Kielhorn (1887: 181 (229)) observed, *lapi* appears to have been inserted on the basis of vt. 3 on P. 3.1.124 (Mbh. II, p. 88, l. 10). However, this vārttika also mentions *dabhi*, which has not been taken into the sūtra in the *Kāśikā*. [366] The *Kāśikā*, none the less, agrees with Kātyāyana, for it deals with this root in the commentary on P. 3.1.126.

2.1.3. P. 3.3.122 reads, in the *Kāśikā*: *adhyāyanyāyodyāvasamhārādhārāvāyāś ca*. The words *ādhārā* and *āvāya* have been added from vt. 1 on P. 3.3.121. If this addition had been made by the authors of the *Kāśikā*, then the word *avahāra* (which is also mentioned in the vārttika) would have been made part of the sūtra as well, for *avahāra* is given in the commentary on P. 3.3.122.

2.1.4. P. 4.2.43 reads, in the *Kāśikā*, *grāmajanabandhusahāyebhyas tal*. The word *sahāya* has been taken from Patañjali's note (Mbh. II, p. 279, l. 19), which also prescribes addition of *gaja*. The *Kāśikā* agrees, dealing with *gaja* in the commentary. If the authors of the *Kāśikā* had changed the sūtra, *gaja* would have become part of it.

Not only the authors of the *Kāśikā* found the sūtras enumerated by Kielhorn in their changed form. There is reason to believe that for many sūtras the form which they have in the *Kāśikā* had become the form generally recognized in the Pāṇinian tradition. When a vārttika or a remark by Patañjali presupposes a form of the sūtra different from what is found in the *Kāśikā*, Kaiyaṭa, the commentator on the *Mahābhāṣya*, often explains this vārttika or remark by Patañjali by pointing out that the sūtra is such-and-such, that certain words are later additions, or not coming from the Ṛṣi (*anārṣa*). Kaiyaṭa's remarks have been reproduced by Kielhorn (1887) and will not be repeated here. With regard to most them it can be said that they are unintelligible but for the assumption that the Pāṇinian tradition preserved these sūtras in their later, changed form, as found in the *Kāśikā*.

2.2. What do we know about the persons who changed the sūtras? Kielhorn (1887) has shown that changes were made under the influence of Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* and Kātyāyana's vārttikas therein. It is, however, particularly interesting that the agreement with Patañjali and Kātyāyana does not go all the way. We saw in § 2.1 four cases where the changer(s) of the sūtras differed in opinion from Kātyāyana/Patañjali. The following are further cases:

(i) P. 3.1.95 reads, in the *Kāśikā*: *kṛtyāḥ prāñ ṇvulaḥ* "The addition of [367] the words *prāñ ṇvulaḥ* has been suggested by Kātyāyana in his Vārt. 1 on Pāṇini's rule, but shown to be in reality superfluous in Vārt. 2" (Kielhorn, 1887: 181 (229)). The addition of these words would be to prevent that *ṆvuL* carry the name *kṛtya*. However, this purpose is fulfilled without these words, by a *jñāpaka* (*trc* in P. 3.3.169: *arhe kṛtyatṛcaś ca*). The person who changed the sūtra apparently preferred an explicit statement to a conclusion drawn from a *jñāpaka*.

(ii) P. 4.2.21 reads, in the *Kāśikā*: *sāsmiṇ paurṇamāsīti sañjñāyām* "The word *sañjñāyām* has been added in accordance with Kātyāyana's Vārttikas on the rule, but has been declared superfluous by Patañjali" (Kielhorn, 1887: 181 (229)). It is superfluous according to Patañjali, because the word *īti* in the sūtra indicates that the suffix *aṆ* prescribed in this sūtra is only added "if there is desire to express [the intended meaning] from the [word obtained by adding this suffix]" (Mbh. II, p. 275, l. 13: *tataś ced vivakṣā*). The person who changed the sūtra apparently preferred an explicit specification to an obscure interpretation of *īti* once again.

(iii) P. 2.1.67 reads, both in the *Kāśikā* and in the *Mahābhāṣya*: *yuvā khalatipalitavalinajaratībhiḥ*. Patañjali, and following him the *Kāśikā*, explain the somewhat confusing use of the feminine ending in *jaratī* by saying that it indicates the paribhāṣā

prātipadikagrahaṇe liṅgaviśiṣṭasyāpi grahaṇam. But Jinendrabuddhi, in his *Nyāsa* (II, p. 89, l. 25-27), tells us that “in another commentary” the last word of the sūtra is *–jaradbhiḥ*, which removes the difficulty. We seem again confronted with a modification made by someone who disliked *jñāpakas*.

We conclude that the sūtras were changed by grammarians who were rather well acquainted with Patañjali’s *Mahābhāṣya*. They attempted to incorporate what they considered of value in the *Mahābhāṣya* into the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. At the same time they felt free to disagree with Patañjali. They further preferred a clear, explicit formulation of sūtras to obscure hints.

2.3. Were the sūtras changed before or after Candra? In other words, did Candra know the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* in the form which it has in the *Kāśikā*, or in an earlier, perhaps the original, form?

This question is very difficult to answer because Candra’s grammar shows clearly that its author was a close student of the *Mahābhāṣya*, who incorporated much from that text into his grammar. Since the sūtras of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* were often changed under the influence of the *Mahābhāṣya* [368] (§ 2.2, above), the two processes were in a sense parallel to each other. Influence of one upon the other, and priority in time of one over the other, are therefore hard to prove.

Our only hope lies in the circumstance that the changes in the sūtras of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* show a certain amount of independence on the part of their makers vis-à-vis the opinion of Patañjali. Since Candra was a close follower of Patañjali, we may hope to discover a place where, out of negligence, he followed the modified sūtra of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* rather than the *Mahābhāṣya*.

2.3.1. Candra was indeed a close follower of the *Mahābhāṣya*. This is most easily demonstrated by taking the sūtras of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* which had been changed under the influence of the *Mahābhāṣya* without following that work in all details (see § 2.1, above) as the point of departure.

- (i) P. 1.3.29 has in the *Kāśikā* the amplified form *samo gamyrcchipracchisvaratyartīśruvidibhyaḥ*. The root *ḍṛś*, though mentioned in the *Mahābhāṣya*, is not included in the rule. The corresponding rule in Candra’s grammar (C. 1.4.71) enumerates the same roots, plus *ḍṛś*: *samo gamyrcchipracchisvṛśruvettyartidṛśaḥ*.
- (ii) P. 3.1.126 has in the *Kāśikā* the amplified form *āsuyuvapirapilapitrapicamaś ca*. The root *dabh*, though mentioned in the *Mahābhāṣya*, is not included. The corresponding rule in Candra’s grammar (C. 1.1.133) enumerates the same roots, plus *dabh*: *āsuyuvapirapilapitrapicamidabhaḥ*.
- (iii) P. 4.2.43 has in the *Kāśikā* the amplified form *grāmajanabandhusahāyebhyas tal*. The word *gaja*, though mentioned in the *Mahābhāṣya*, is not included. The corresponding rule in

Candra's grammar (C. 3.1.59) enumerates the same words, plus *gaja*:
grāmajanagajabandhusahāyāt tal.

We learn from this that Candra followed the *Mahābhāṣya* more closely, with fewer reservations, than those who changed the sūtras of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. (This, together with § 2.1, shows, incidentally, that the view that the authors of the *Kāśikā* changed the sūtras under the influence of Candra's grammar, is simply untenable. See also Birwé, 1958: 142-44.) It is not, however, possible to conclude from it anything regarding their mutual relation. The above evidence leaves the possibility open that Candra and the persons who changed sūtras of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* worked in complete independence from each other.

2.3.2. The following case is different. P. 3.3.122 has in the *Kāśikā* the [369] amplified form *adhyāyanyāyodyāvasaṃhārādhārāyāvāś ca*. We saw (§ 2.1) that the word *avahārā*, though mentioned in the *Mahābhāṣya*, is not included. We expect in Candra's grammar the same list, plus *avahārā*. We find, in the Vṛtti on C. 1.3.101, this list: *adhyāya, nyāya, udyāva, saṃhāra, ādhāra, āvāya*. Here too *avahārā* is lacking.

This mistake on the part of Candra is easily intelligible on the assumption that he knew the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (or at any rate P. 3.3.122) in its changed form, as found in the *Kāśikā*. Without this assumption it becomes virtually unintelligible. We conclude that the changes in some of the sūtras of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* were made before Candra, and were known to him.^{76a}

2.4. The question which remains unanswered is: did the pre-Candra grammarians make changes in sūtras which cannot be discovered with the help of Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya*? The question is not without importance. The changes that were discovered could be found with the help of the *Mahābhāṣya* (by Kielhorn, and before him by Kaiyaṭa and others). Without the *Mahābhāṣya* they would have remained unnoticed! That is to say, changes which cannot be discovered on the basis of the *Mahābhāṣya* — if such there are — could remain in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* without ever being recognized as such.

Kielhorn does not share our misgivings. He concludes his article about the changed sūtras in the *Kāśikā* in the following manner (1887: 184 (232)):

Have the rules of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* since the time of the composition of the *Mahābhāṣya* undergone any changes besides those which have been indicated in the preceding, and in particular, is there any reason to suppose that other new rules have been added to the original text? After the careful study which I have given to the *Mahābhāṣya* and the literature connected with it, I feel no hesitation in answering the

⁷ The *Nyāsa* on P. 4.1.128 (*catākāyā airak*) makes the impression that its author Jinendrabuddhi all by himself draws the (faulty) inference that the original form of this sūtra was *catākād airak* (III, p. 465, l. 23-24: *evam 'catākād airak' ity etat sūtram āsīt, idānīm pramādāc ca 'catākāyāḥ' iti pāṭhaḥ*). The fact that also Candra has *catākād airak* (C. 2.4.58) does not prove influence of Candra on Jinendrabuddhi or of an earlier source on both, for both authors simply follow vt. 1 on P. 4.1.128. This remark in the *Nyāsa* must be seen against the background of its tendency to get everything out of the sūtras, by hook or by crook (see Bhim Sen Shastri, 1979: 37-45).

question in the negative. Besides the 1,713 rules, which are actually treated by Kātyāyana and Patañjali, nearly 600 rules are fully and about 350 other rules partly quoted in the *Mahābhāṣya*. And as a large number of other rules is absolutely necessary for the proper understanding of those rules for which we have the direct testimony of Patañjali, and for the formation of words used by that scholar in the course of his arguments — I refer to the numerous quotations at the foot of the pages in my edition — we may rest satisfied that our text of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, or rather the text of the best MSS., does not in any material point differ from the text which was known to Patañjali.

Kielhorn's answer does not really fit his question. Let us agree that our text of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, i.e. the text found in the *Kāśikā*, does not in any material point differ from the text known to Patañjali. This does not change [370] the fact that Kielhorn could enumerate — according to his own counting — 58 differences in it from the text known to Patañjali. What prevents us from assuming that there may be another 58, or 158, such differences in it?

There is another point. Kātyāyana and Patañjali, so Kielhorn tells us in the above passage, treat of 1713 rules. But how did these rules occur in the Mss? The Mss. on which Kielhorn based his edition of the *Mahābhāṣya* gave only the beginnings of the rules (Kielhorn, 1885: 191 (194); 1887: 179 (227)), and this may have been so throughout the history of the *Mahābhāṣya*. We had occasion (§ 2.1, above) to observe that Kaiyaṭa often found it necessary to inform his readers of the original form of a sūtra. This can only mean that the Mss. of the *Mahābhāṣya* with which he was acquainted either had merely short indications of the sūtras (e.g., the beginnings), or that they contained the sūtras in their later, changed, forms.

In view of this, the sūtras contained in the *Kāśikā* may have differed from those known to Patañjali in more than the 58 respects enumerated by Kielhorn. This is supported by the fact that Kielhorn (1885: 197 (200)) can give twelve cases where the *Kāśikā* mentions two readings for one sūtra, among them the following:

P. 7.2.49 reads: *sanīvantardhabhrasjadambhuśrisvryūrṇubharajñāpisanām*. In the commentary the *Kāśikā* remarks that some read the end of the sūtra as *bharajñāpisanitanipatidaridrāṇām* (II, p. 813: *kecid atra bharajñāpisanitanipatidaridrāṇām iti paṭhanti*). Similarly, P. 7.3.17 reads: *parimāṇāntasyāsañjñāśāṇayoh*; the *Kāśikā* informs us that some read the end of this sūtra as *asañjñāśāṇakulijānām*. We note that these alternative forms of the two sūtras seem to have been followed by Candra: C. 5.4.119 reads *sanīvantardhabhrasjadambhuśrisvryūrṇubharajñāpisanitanipatidaridraḥ*; C. 6.1.26 reads *saṃkhyāyāḥ saṃvatsaraparimāṇasyāsañjñāśāṇakulijasya*. (The *Kāśikā* does not, of course, refer to Candra's grammar in these two places. Candra's grammar, being a grammar in its own right, does not contain Pāṇini's rules in this or that version. It contains Candra's rules!)

In order to see the significance of these remarks in the *Kāśikā*, we note that in the majority of cases of changed rules enumerated by Kielhorn, the *Kāśikā* shows no sign of being aware of this fact. The exceptions are: The authors of the *Kāśikā* may have known that something had happened in some cases of *yogavibhāga* (see the *Kāśikā* on P. 1.4.58 (I, p. 88),

P. 6.1.32 (II, p. 604), P. 7.3.119 (II, p. 859)). On P. 6.1.115 (*prakṛtyāntaḥpādam avyapare* in the *Kāśikā*) the *Kāśikā* gives the correct form of the sūtra as read by some (II, p. 626: *kecid idaṃ sūtram nāntaḥpādam avyapare iti* [371] *paṭhanti*). On P. 7.3.77 (*iṣugamiyamām chaḥ* in the *Kāśikā*) it indicates that certain grammarians read instead of *iṣu* the original form without *u* (II, p. 850: *ye tu iṣim uditam nādhīyate te...*). And on P. 6.1.156, which originally was no sūtra at all, the *Kāśikā* observes (II, p. 635): *kecid idaṃ nādhīyate, pāṣkaraprabhṛtiṣv eva kāraskaro vṛkṣaḥ iti paṭhanti*. It is not impossible that some, or even all, of these few cases were not memories from the time before changes were introduced into the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, but on the contrary reconstructions made by close students of the *Mahābhāṣya*. This further supports the opinion that in the majority of cases the *Kāśikā* did not in any way know that its sūtras were not original. If, therefore, the *Kāśikā* shows different readings in the case of several sūtras (see above), differences which cannot be chosen between on the basis of the *Mahābhāṣya*, this is to be considered an indication that the sūtras in the *Kāśikā* may contain far more deviations from the text known to Patañjali than Kielhorn suspected.

2.5. It can be argued that Bhartṛhari's *Mahābhāṣyadīpikā* on Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* on P. 1.1.38 contains an indication that Bhartṛhari was aware that earlier grammarians in the Pāṇinian tradition at times felt free to change the wording of sūtras of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*.

P. 1.1.38 reads: *taddhitaś cāsarvavibhaktiḥ*. The *Mahābhāṣya* (I, p. 96, l. 1-5), as interpreted by Bhartṛhari (D. p. 230, l. 15-16), discusses the proposal to read the rule as follows: *asarvavibhaktiḥ*, i.e., to drop the words *taddhitaś ca*. The proposal is rejected on the ground that the reading *asarvavibhaktiḥ* would have as undesired consequence that the numerals *eka*, *dvi* and *bahu* would become indeclinables (*avyaya*). After explaining this, Bhartṛhari remarks (D. p. 230, l. 15-16): “Therefore, in order to exclude these [words], even Kuṇi must accept [the word] *taddhita* [in the sūtra]” (*ata eṣāṃ vyāvṛttyartham kuṇināpi taddhitagrahaṇam kartavyam*).

It turns out that difficulties remain. Patañjali, as interpreted by Bhartṛhari, therefore comes to the conclusion that it is better to enumerate all indeclinables in the gaṇa belonging to P. 1.1.37 (*svarāḍi*). Bhartṛhari describes this in the following passage (D. p. 230, l. 21-24):

*ato gaṇapāṭha eva jyāyān asyāpi vṛttikāśyety etad anena pratipādayati
kṛttaddhitānām grahaṇam gaṇapāṭhe eval kṛtaś ca taddhitaś ca gaṇa eva paṭhitavyā itil
tasmimś ca satīdam sūtram uktaśūtrakāravṛttikārayor lakṣaṇabhāvena pravṛttam ity
etad avasthitam*
[372]

“Therefore, a mere (*eva*) enumeration [of the indeclinables] in the gaṇa [*svarāḍi* belonging to P. 1.1.37] is better even [in the opinion] of this Vṛttikāra. This [Patañjali] explains with these [words]: *kṛttaddhitānām gaṇapāṭhe eva*.⁸ That is to say (*iti*): [words ending in] *kṛt* [suffixes] and [words ending in] *taddhita* [suffixes] must be enumerated only in the gaṇa [*svarāḍi* belonging to P. 1.1.37]. And that being so, this

⁸ Kielhorn's edition has (I, p. 96, l. 5): *kṛttaddhitānām grahaṇam ca pāṭhe*.

sūtra (P. 1.1.38) has been brought forth as a sign of the [above-] mentioned Sūtrakāra and Vṛttikāra; this is certain.”

It goes without saying that much is unclear in these two passages from Bhartṛhari’s commentary. We first observe that there is no reason to doubt that “this Vṛttikāra” is Kuṇi, for the simple reason that no other person is mentioned to whom it could refer. But who can be the “[above-]mentioned Sūtrakāra”? Pāṇini cannot be meant, for he is not mentioned anywhere nearby. Moreover, in a commentary on the *Mahābhāṣya* Pāṇini can never be an “above-mentioned” Sūtrakāra, he is *the* Sūtrakāra.

I think the two passages make satisfactory sense if we assume that Bhartṛhari here makes fun of Kuṇi. Kuṇi was, first of all, a Vṛttikāra. He did not, however, feel shy to make changes in the sūtras of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, where he considered that advantageous. Bhartṛhari’s first remark, according to which *even Kuṇi* had to leave the sūtra P. 1.1.38 unchanged, testifies to this. But this activity made Kuṇi into a kind of Sūtrakāra. Bhartṛhari’s second passage speaks about Kuṇi, “the above-mentioned Sūtrakāra *cum* Vṛttikāra”. In order to understand the passage in this way, we must assume that *uktasūtrakāravṛttikārayor* originally had a singular ending and not a dual.⁹ This poses no real problem, for the two words *sūtrakāra* and *vṛttikāra*, when compounded, almost ask for a dual ending, which may have been introduced into the text at some time in its history, during which it was neglected to such an extent that now only one corrupt and incomplete Ms. of it remains.

So Kuṇi did two things: he left P. 1.1.38, unchanged, in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, but he still included the indeclinables covered by P. 1.1.38-40 (and perhaps P. 1.1.41) in the gaṇa belonging to P. 1.1.37. Bhartṛhari’s remark that P. 1.1.38 is “a sign of the [above-]mentioned Sūtrakāra *cum* Vṛttikāra” seems to be intended sarcastically: it shows Kuṇi’s stupidity.

Be this as it may. The *Kāśikā* contains a feature which may be taken to support our interpretation of the above two passages of Bhartṛhari’s commentary. The *Kāśikā*, of course, has all the sūtras P. 1.1.37-41; but besides and in spite of this, it enumerates in the commentary on P. 1.1.37 — [373] that means: in the gaṇa *svarādi* — all the indeclinables, including those which are indeclinables by virtue of P. 1.1.38-41. It includes the indeclinables falling under P. 1.1.38-40 by repeating those sūtras, literally or in paraphrase, with a precise specification of the suffixes which are to be included, especially for P. 1.1.38. That is to say, the *Kāśikā* makes exactly the mistake¹⁰ for which Kuṇi is ridiculed by Bhartṛhari. This is the

⁹ Prof. R. Gombrich suggests an original *uktasūtrakārasya ca vṛttikārasya ca*. This ambiguous expression would indeed leave undecided whether one or two persons are meant.

¹⁰ Interestingly, the *Kāśikā* under P. 1.1.41 tries to give a justification for this obvious deficiency, saying (I, p. 19): *sarvam idaṃ kāṇḍam svarādāv api pathyate/punarvacanam anityatvajñāpanārtham/*. That is to say, the double occurrence of P. 1.1.38-41, both in the Sūtrapāṭha and in the Gaṇapāṭha, serves the purpose of indicating that these sūtras are not universally valid. Some examples illustrating this are then given. Clearly this passage of the *Kāśikā* carries not conviction.

more significant since we have reason to think that the *Kāśikā* was to a large extent influenced by earlier commentaries (§§ 3 and 4, below).

It is of some importance to note that the above two passages from Bhartṛhari's *Mahābhāṣyadīpikā* do not imply that, in Bhartṛhari's opinion, Kuṇi lived before Patañjali. What is more, there is no reason to think that Patañjali — apart from proposing changes — actually made any in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* or its appendices; nor would he, one would think, condone such changes when made by others. The fact that Patañjali proposes certain changes in the Gaṇapāṭha must, therefore, be understood to indicate that the Gaṇapāṭha as he knew it had not yet undergone those changes. (See further § 3 below). It follows that Kuṇi must have lived and worked after Patañjali and before Bhartṛhari.

2.6. Evidence regarding the late origin of other sūtras will be discussed in § 6.2, and note 31.

III

3.1. We have, in § 2.5, unexpectedly been confronted with a case where an early (pre-Bhartṛhari) commentator made changes in the Gaṇapāṭha, which are, moreover, the embodiment of a proposal made by Patañjali. It can be shown in many more cases that such changes were made in the Gaṇapāṭha.¹¹ They have been studied by Ojihara (1968a; 1968b; 1969-70), whom we shall follow.

It is to be noted that for a study of the early history of the Gaṇapāṭha in the Pāṇinian tradition, we are — with few exceptions, such as the one discussed in § 2.5 above — dependent upon the *Kāśikā*. This commentary contains the oldest surviving Pāṇinian gaṇas, enumerated under the sūtras to which they belong.

3.2. Our first problem is to find out whether or not the authors of the [374] *Kāśikā* felt free to make changes in the Gaṇapāṭha as it was handed down to them. We know (§§ 1.5; 2.1, above) that they accepted the text of the Dhātu- and Sūtrapāṭha as unchangeable and authoritative. This strongly suggests that they looked upon the Gaṇapāṭha in the same way. Moreover, most of the changes which Ojihara has shown to date from the time after Patañjali, are also found in the Vṛtti to Candra's grammar, which appears to have been written by Candra himself. It would, however, still be conceivable that Candra and the authors of the *Kāśikā* made these changes independently of each other, both on the basis of Patañjali's

¹¹ A gaṇasūtra that must have been added roughly in the time of the invasion of Alexander and therefore after Pāṇini and before Patañjali is *sambhūyo* 'mbhasoḥ salopaś ca in the gaṇa *bāhvādi* on P. 4.1.96; see Lévi, 1890: 234-36. The same may be true of *bhagalā* in that same gaṇa, and *subhūta* in the gaṇa *saṅkalādi* on P. 4.2.75 (Lévi, 1890: 237-39). Cf. Birwé, 1961: 82-85, 168-69.

Mahābhāṣya. Fortunately there are some passages in the *Kāśikā* which show beyond doubt that the authors of the *Kāśikā* did not tamper with the text of the Gaṇapāṭha.

3.2.1. P. 4.1.105 refers to a gaṇa *gargādi* “*garga* etc.”. This gaṇa has two interior gaṇas (*antargaṇa*), *lohitādi* and *kaṇvādi*, referred to in P. 4.1.18 and P. 4.2.111 respectively. The last word of the interior gaṇa *lohitādi* is *kata*. This too is stated in P. 4.1.18. The word *kata* occurs, in the encompassing gaṇa *gargādi*, before *kaṇva*. The interior gaṇas *lohitādi* and *kaṇvādi* do not, therefore, overlap; they have no word in common.

This is not to the liking of Kātyāyana and Patañjali. They think, for reasons that are discussed by Ojihara (1969-70: 105-08), that *śakala* should be part of both the interior gaṇas *lohitādi* and *kaṇvādi*. In the gaṇa *gargādi* as given in the *Kāśikā*, *śakala* comes immediately after *kaṇva* (see Birwé, 1961: 103), and is therefore included in the interior gaṇa *kaṇvādi*, but not in *lohitādi*. To solve the difficulty, Patañjali quotes with apparent approval a śloka-vārttika, in which the following proposal is made: *śakala* must be placed before *kaṇva*, after *kata*; the interior gaṇas *lohitādi* and *kaṇvādi* are to be considered as ending, resp. beginning, with *śakala* (Mbh. II, p. 210, l. 18-19: *kaṇvāt tu śakalaḥ pūrvaḥ katād uttara iṣyate/ pūrvottarau tadantādī.../*). If Patañjali’s proposal is followed, the gaṇa *gargādi* will become: *garga... lohita... kata, śakala, kaṇva...*

We noticed already that the Gaṇapāṭha contained in the *Kāśikā* has not followed Patañjali’s proposal. It is remarkable, however, that the *Kāśikā* on P. 4.1.18 quotes the above-mentioned śloka-vārttika. This can only mean that the author of this part of the *Kāśikā* agrees with Patañjali. In spite of that, he does not introduce the changes proposed by Patañjali into the gaṇa *gargādi*.

[The *Kāśikā* attempts to solve a problem which arises when Patañjali’s [375] proposal is followed. P. 4.1.18 describes the interior gaṇa *lohitādi* as *katanta* “ending with *kata*”¹², and the interior gaṇa *kaṇvādi* begins, of course, with *kaṇva*. How then does *śakala* belong to both if Patañjali’s proposal is followed? The *Kāśikā* has the following solution: *katanta* in P. 4.1.18 is *ekaśeṣa* (“retention of one”; see P. 1.2.64) of a bahuvrīhi and a tatpuruṣa compound, thus meaning: “[the row of words] of which [the first one is *lohita* and] the last one *kata*, plus the end of *kata*”. The “end of *kata*” is, of course, the word following *kata*, i.e., *śakala*. In a similar manner *kaṇvādi* is made to include the word *śakala*, which precedes *kaṇva*. (II, p. 322: *katantebhyaḥ iti bahuvrīhitatpuruṣayor ekaśeṣaḥ, tathā kaṇvādibhyo gotre itil tatra tatpuruṣavṛtṭyā saṃgrhīto madhyapātī śakalaśabdo...*) The sophistication of this solution¹³ is worthy of a commentary on the *Mahābhāṣya*, and is certainly out of place in the *Kāśikā*. This strongly suggests that the *Kāśikā* knew a commentary on the *Mahābhāṣya*. We know of only

¹² Regarding the irregular form of *katanta* instead of *katānta*, see Ojihara, 1969-70: 105n.

¹³ The proposal of the *Mahābhāṣya* rather seems to be to change the reading of P. 4.1.18 and 4.2.111 in such a manner that *katanta* is replaced by *śakalānta*, *kaṇvādi* by *śakalādi*. This has actually been done in Candra’s corresponding rules C. 2.3.20 and C. 3.2.21 resp.

one such commentary written before the *Kāśikā*: Bhartṛhari's. It seems confirmed that the *Kāśikā* got its solution from Bhartṛhari's *Mahābhāṣyadīpikā* by the fact that Kaiyaṭa's *Mahābhāṣyapradīpa* on the Bhāṣya to P. 4.1.18 has the same solution; Kaiyaṭa admits his indebtedness to Bhartṛhari's commentary in the introductory verses to his own commentary. But if indeed the *Kāśikā* borrowed here from Bhartṛhari's *Mahābhāṣyadīpikā*, then that commentary extended at least until P. 4.1.18.]

3.2.2. A second indication that the authors of the *Kāśikā* accepted the Gaṇapāṭha as they received it, is found on the sūtras 8.4.7 and 11. P. 8.4.7 reads: *ahno 'dantāt [pūrvapadāt 3, raṣābhyām no ṇaḥ 1]* "After a preceding member [of the compound] which ends in *a*, after *r* and *ṣ*, [in the place] of *n* of [the word] *ahna*, [comes] *ṇ*." It is not fully clear how the *Kāśikā* can consider *ahno* of the sūtra a genitive of *ahna*, but there can be no doubt that it does. It does so for a special reason, which is mentioned in the following sentence of the commentary (II, p. 968):

ahnaḥ ity akārāntagrahaṇād dīrghāhnī śarad ity atra na bhavati

"Because the word *ahnaḥ*, which ends in *a*, has been used [in the sūtra, not *ahan*, which is substituted by *ahna* in certain circumstances by P. 5.4.88, the sūtra] is not [applicable] in *dīrghāhnī śarad*."

This sentence — which follows the *Mahābhāṣya* (III, p. 455, l. 14-16; cf. [376] Ojihara, 1968a: 569-70) — explains the absence of retroflexion in *dīrghāhnī*. The *Mahābhāṣya* offers an alternative explanation as well: We can simply read *ahnaḥ* as the genitive of *ahan*, but add *dīrghāhnī śarad* to the gaṇa *yuvādi* which belongs to vt. 3 on P. 8.4.11. This vārttika prescribes that words contained in the gaṇa *yuvādi* do not undergo retroflexion when preceded, in a compound, by *r* and *ṣ*.

It is remarkable that the *Kāśikā* on P. 8.4.11 contains this vārttika and its gaṇa, including *dīrghāhnī śarad*. This double justification of the same form is clearly superfluous in the *Kāśikā* and could have been avoided easily by dropping *dīrghāhnī śarad* from the gaṇa *yuvādi*. The fact that this has not happened can be taken as an indication that the authors of the *Kāśikā* did not change gaṇas, not even vārttika-gaṇas.

3.2.3. Our third case is similar to the second in that the *Kāśikā* again accounts in two ways for one and the same form. P. 6.1.63 prescribes, among other things, substitution of *nas* for *nāsikā* in the weak cases (*śasprabhṛtiṣu*). The commentary, following the *Mahābhāṣya* (III, p. 42, l. 1-5), adds two statements (II, p. 623):

(1) *nas nāsikāyā yattaskṣudreṣu* "nas [in the place] of *nāsikā* before *yat*, *tas* and *kṣudra*."

(2) *yati varṇanagarayor neti vaktavyam* "It must be stated that [there is] no [substitution of *nas* for *nāsikā*] in the case of a sound (*varṇa*) and a town."

This last statement accounts for *nāsikyo varṇaḥ* “nasal sound” and *nāsikyam nagaram* “the town of Nasik”.

The second of the above two statements is subsequently rejected in the *Mahābhāṣya*. The form *nāsikyo varṇaḥ*, Patañjali tells us, can be obtained by reading *nāsikā* in the gaṇa *parimukhādi* (vt. 1 on P. 4.3.58), *nāsikyam nagaram* by reading *nāsikā* in the gaṇa *saṃkāśādi* (P. 4.2.80). The gaṇa *parimukhādi* does not contain the word *nāsikā* anywhere, probably for the reasons which have been explained by Ojihara (1969-70: 95-99), but the gaṇa *saṃkāśādi* does, also in the *Kāśikā* (I, p. 384). That is to say, the phrase *nāsikyam nagaram* is accounted for in two ways.¹⁴ This is most easily explained if we assume that the authors of the *Kāśikā* did not feel free to make changes in the Gaṇapāṭha.

3.2.4. P. 4.1.80 reads: *krauḍyādibhyaś ca* [striyām 3, ṣyañ 78] “And after [377] *krauḍi* etc., in the feminine, *Ṣyañ*.” The *Kāśikā* lists all the words which belong to the gaṇa *krauḍyādi* (I, p. 338). The last one is *gaukakṣya* (see also Birwé, 1961: 75).

The feminine of *gaukakṣya* is now formed by adding *Ṣyañ*, and after this, by P. 4.1.74 (*yañś cāp*), *CāP*, as follows (cf. Ojihara, 1969-70: 109): *gaukakṣya-Ṣyañ - CāP* > *gaukakṣya-ya-ā* (P. 6.1.148) > *gaukakṣya-ā* (P. 6.1.151) > *gaukakṣyā* (P. 6.1.101).

What must be noted is that on P. 4.1.74 the *Kāśikā* accounts for *gaukakṣyā* in another way. P. 4.1.74 (*yañś cāp*) prescribes the feminine suffix *CāP* after words ending in *yañ*. The *Kāśikā* quotes a vārttika here (cf. vt. 1 on P. 4.1.74): *ṣāc ca yañah* [*cāp*] “And *CāP* [comes] after *yañ*, [which comes itself] after *ṣ*.” Among the illustrations the *Kāśikā* enumerates *gaukakṣyā*. It can do so since *gaukakṣya* is derived from *gokakṣa* by suffixation of *yañ* (P. 4.1.105). The *Kāśikā* concludes its comments on P. 4.1.74 by suggesting a third way to account for *gaukakṣyā* (at the same time a second way to account for the other forms covered by the quoted vārttika; I, p. 337): *uttarasūtre cakāro 'nuktasamuccayārthaḥ, tena vā bhaviṣyati* “Or [what is to be obtained by this vārttika] will be [obtained] by the word *ca* which occurs in the next sūtra (i.e., P. 4.1.75: *āvatyāc ca*) in order to include [words] that have not been [explicitly] stated.”

It is clear that the authors of the *Kāśikā* could have profitably dropped *gaukakṣya* from the gaṇa *krauḍyādi*. They would even have had the blessing of Patañjali (Mbh. II, p. 228, l. 4; cf. Ojihara, 1969-70: 108 f.). Its presence in that gaṇa confirms that they did not feel free to make changes in the Gaṇapāṭha.

[It is true that inclusion of *gaukakṣya* in the gaṇa *krauḍyādi* would lead to the form *gaukakṣīputra*, whereas the alternative justification of *gaukakṣyā* (by vt. 1 on P. 4.1.74) would lead to *gaukakṣyāputra*; see Ojihara, 1969-70: 109. It does not, however, seem that the authors of the *Kāśikā* were influenced by or even aware of this difference. They do not, as far as I know, discuss either of these two forms.]

¹⁴ Regarding the different accentuation which one would expect, see Ojihara, 1969-70: 86 n. 9 and 96 n. 31.

3.3.1. The case of § 3.2.2 can also be used to show that the *Kāśikā* did not copy its gaṇas from Candra. The interpretation given to C. 6.4.106 (which corresponds to P. 8.4.7) shows that Candra, like the *Kāśikā*, looks upon *ahnaḥ* as a genitive of *ahna*. Here too the aim of this is said to be the explanation of *dīrghāhnī śarad*. C. 6.4.112 corresponds to P. 8.4.11, but [378] incorporates vt. 3 on P. 8.4.11, and mentions therefore the gaṇa *yuvādi*. This gaṇa, as given in the *Vṛtti*, is almost identical with the one given in the *Kāśikā*, but does not contain *dīrghāhnī śarad*. Borrowing from Candra would in this particular case have been very advantageous for the *Kāśikā*. The fact that it did not borrow here indicates that it probably did not borrow anywhere.

3.3.2. The same point of view is supported by the three cases discussed by Ojihara (1969-70: 82-83, 105) where the gaṇas of Candra's grammar have incorporated suggestions made by Patañjali, as opposed to the gaṇas in the *Kāśikā* which have not. These cases indicate once again that Candra tried to remain in close agreement with Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya*.

3.4. As usual, it is difficult to find evidence concerning the date of the changes introduced into the Gaṇapāṭha found in the *Kāśikā*. In § 2.6 we came to think that at least some changes were made before Bhartṛhari. Here we shall study two cases which indicate that the changes were made before Candra. As was the case with the Dhātu- and Sūtrapāṭha, our clues are mistakes made by Candra.

3.4.1. Patañjali states on P. 3.1.13 (II, p. 24, l. 2; cf. Ojihara, 1968a: 576) that the gaṇa *lohitādi* contains no words ending in *n*. Candra, on the corresponding sūtra C. 1.1.31, gives the illustrations *varmāyati* and *varmāyate*, indicating that he considered the word *varman* to belong to *lohitādi*. He even calls this gaṇa an *ākṛtigaṇa*. Candra here deviates from the *Mahābhāṣya*. Considering his usual close adherence to that work, we must conclude that he was this time led astray by one of the early commentaries on the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* which he used.

The *Kāśikā* on P. 3.1.13 is in agreement with the *Cāndra-vyākaraṇa* in stating that *lohitādi* is an *ākṛtigaṇa*, and in giving as illustrations *varmāyati* and *varmāyate*. Since, however, the *Kāśikā* did not borrow from Candra, both must have borrowed from a common source directly or indirectly.

3.4.2. Ojihara (1968b) explains a difficult passage of the *Mahābhāṣya*, which must be so understood that the words *droṇa*, *kuṭa* and *pātra* should be included in the gaṇa *gaurādi* to make them able to receive the feminine suffix *Ñiṣ* by P. 4.1.41. This proposal has been partially followed in the [379] existing Gaṇapāṭhas: all have *droṇa*, some late ones have *kuṭa*, none have *pātra* (cf. also Birwé, 1961: 52-65). Ojihara (1968b: 135-37) has explained why

grammarians may not have found it necessary to include *kuṭa* and *pātra* in the gaṇa *gaurādi*: the desired suffix *ÑiṢ* would be obtained even without this.

This explanation as well as the inclusion of *droṇa* in the gaṇa *gaurādi* fit very well a situation where grammarians studied the *Mahābhāṣya* but did not feel bound by it. Grammarians who considered the *Mahābhāṣya* infallible would not have entered *droṇa* into the gaṇa *gaurādi* (for apparently Patañjali knew this gaṇa without *droṇa*), or, if they were to make any changes at all, they would have included all three words — *droṇa*, *kuṭa* and *pātra* — into the gaṇa (for this is what is implicitly suggested in the *Mahābhāṣya*).

Also Candra's gaṇa *gaurādi* (on C. 2.3.37) contains *droṇa*, but not *kuṭa* and *pātra*. This deviation from the *Mahābhāṣya* is most easily explained by assuming that Candra borrowed this gaṇa from others. That is to say, *droṇa* was entered into the gaṇa *gaurādi* before Candra.

IV

4.1. The *Kāśikā* shows a number of features which are not present in the *Mahābhāṣya* but which *are* present in Candra's grammar. Kielhorn (1886) enumerated many such features¹⁵ and considered them striking enough to think that he could “prove that the compilers of the *Kāśikā* have diligently used that [i.e., Candra's] grammar” (p. 183 (244)) on the basis of them.

Kielhorn's opinion presents him with some difficulties which he mentions himself (1886: 184-85 (245-46)). On p. 184 (245) he says: “Strange it appears that the compilers of the *Kāśikā* should never have mentioned Chandra and his grammar; that they should not have done so even in connection with rules such as Pāṇini II.4, 21; IV.3, 115; and VI.2, 14, where by quoting the *Chāndra-Vyākaraṇa* they would, one might say, have much more vividly illustrated Pāṇini's meaning, than by the examples which they have actually given.” In all these places Kielhorn thinks that the example *candropajñam asaṃjñākaṃ vyākaraṇam* (given in the *Vṛtti* on C. 2.2.68) would have been appropriate.

On p. 185 (246) Kielhorn continues: “Nor can I quite understand why Chandra's grammar, and those who studied it, should have been passed [380] over in the commentary on Pāṇini V.1, 58 and IV.2, 65. When the authors had occasions to speak of the *three* Adhyāyas of Kāśakṛitsna's Sūtra, of the *eight* of Pāṇini's, and of the *ten* of Vyāghrapād's, they surely could not have helped thinking of the Sūtra of Chandra, which contains *six*¹⁶ Adhyāyas.”

It may be that the solution to the above problems lies in a direction which Kielhorn himself indicated in the same article (1886: 184 (245)): “(...) Chandra has not, like some of the later grammarians, merely copied from the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, the *Vārttikas*, and the

¹⁵ Mahesh Dutt Sharma, 1974: 93-110 enumerates even more of them.

¹⁶ In point of fact, Candra's grammar may originally have had *eight* Adhyāyas; see Scharfe, 1977: 164. This by itself may explain the non-mention of Candra's grammar in this connection.

Mahābhāṣya; (...) he also has either tried to improve on those works himself, or *has in addition to them used other works, which do not seem to exist any longer*” (my italics).

Since we have come to the conclusion that Candrar and the authors of the *Kāśikā* had their knowledge of the sūtras of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* from a common source (§ 2.3, above), it does not seem adventurous to assume that this common source consisted of the sūtras of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* plus one or more commentaries on them.¹⁷ Both Candrar and the *Kāśikā* made use of these works and, for this reason, show points of similarity even with respect to features which are not found in the *Mahābhāṣya*. We do not now have to suppose that the authors of the *Kāśikā* made use of, or even knew, Candrar’s grammar.

If this assumption is correct, some more information is gained about the Pāṇinian grammarians who preceded Candrar. Not only did they incorporate information from the *Mahābhāṣya* into the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* by making changes in Sūtrapāṭha, Dhātupāṭha and Gaṇapāṭha. They further accounted for new forms in other ways, e.g., by adding *iṣṭis* and *upasaṅkhyānas*.¹⁸ In this connection it may be observed that many of the *iṣṭis* and *upasaṅkhyānas* in the *Kāśikā* have nothing corresponding to them in the *Mahābhāṣya*.

4.2. A case where both *Cāndravyākaraṇa* and *Kāśikā* go against the *Bhāṣya* is the following. C. 3.1.44 prescribes the suffix *aṇ* in the sense ‘collection’ (*samūha*) after *bhikṣā* etc. (*bhikṣādibhyo ’ṇ*). The Vṛtti enumerates the words which belong to the gaṇa *bhikṣādi*; one of them is *yuvati*. The Vṛtti observes (I, p. 284): *pāṭhasāmarthyān na puṁvadbhāvaḥ/ yauvatam/* “On account of the fact that [*yuvati*] is read [in the gaṇa *bhikṣādi*], no masculinization [takes place. The result of adding *aṇ* to *yuvati* is therefore] *yauvata* (‘collection of young women’).”

The masculinization referred to by Candrar is prescribed in C. 5.2.32 [381] (*yacy aṇādau*), before *aṇ* and other suffixes. Since the masculine word corresponding to *yuvati* is *yuvan*, masculinization would give rise to *yauvana* in the sense ‘collection of young women’, rather than to *yauvata*. (For details of the derivation, see Ojihar, 1969-70: 99-100. Rules in Candrar’s grammar corresponding to the Pāṇinian rules given by Ojihar can be found with the help of Liebhich, 1928.)

It is remarkable that Patañjali on P. 4.2.38 (which corresponds to C. 3.1.44) appears to consider *yauvana*, not *yauvata*, the correct form resulting from *yuvati-aṇ*. This is the reason that he thinks — on the basis of arguments which have been explained by Ojihar (1969-70: 100-02) — that the presence of *yuvati* in the gaṇa *bhikṣādi* serves no purpose. That is to say, according to Patañjali *yuvati* is in the gaṇa *bhikṣādi* where it should not be.

We have seen that Candrar kept *yuvati* in the gaṇa *bhikṣādi*, and justified it in a way which is not in agreement with the *Mahābhāṣya*. It is hard to believe that Candrar deliberately

¹⁷ That the *Kāśikā* knew at least one earlier Vṛtti on the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, follows from the fact that it refers to one in its first introductory verse (p. 1: *vṛttau bhāṣye tathā dhātunāmapārāyaṇādīṣu/ viprakīrṇasya tantrasya kriyate sārasaṅgrahaḥ/*)

¹⁸ This is how the *Kāśikā* calls the statements in its concluding verse (II, p. 982). Regarding the occurrences of this verse as second introductory verse, see Appendix I.

deviated from the *Mahābhāṣya* since his work is characterized by close adherence to that book. It seems far more likely that the above remark came inadvertently into his *Vṛtti* from some older commentary on the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*.

A similar remark occurs in the *Kāśikā* on P. 4.2.38 (I, p. 372): *yuvatiśabdo 'tra paṭhyate, tasya grahaṇasāmarthyāt puṃvadbhāvo na bhavati 'bhasyādhe taddhite'* (vt. 11 on P. 6.3.35) *iti/ yuvatīnām samūho yauvatam/*. We must assume that this justification of *yauvata* (which contradicts Patañjali) was thought out before Candra.

4.3. We have come to know the name of one early commentator on the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* in § 2.6 above. Kuṇi, we learned, lived after Patañjali and before Bhartṛhari, for he is mentioned in the latter's *Mahābhāṣyadīpikā*. His opinion is again referred to in Kaiyaṭa's *Mahābhāṣyapradīpa* on P. 1.1.75 (p. 555b, l. 1) and in Haradatta's *Padamañjarī* on P. 1.1.75 (I, p. 259, l. 5).

Bhartṛhari knew more commentators on the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* than alone Kuṇi. He repeatedly refers to them in his *Mahābhāṣyadīpikā* without however mentioning their names. It seems to follow from the following sentence that he knew at least three such commentators (D. p. 221, l. 19; on P. 1.1.38): "On account of a difference in the analysis [of the compound *asarvavibhaktiḥ* in P. 1.1.38] the *Vṛttikāras* have different opinions [regarding the exact meaning of P. 1.1.38]" (*vigrahabhedād bhedaṃ pratipannā vṛttikārāḥ*). One commentary is referred to by the name 'Nyāsa' (D. p. 233, l. 18).

[382]

Mīmāṃsaka (1973: I: 439 ff.) has collected references to early grammarians in grammatical and other works. His list includes, besides Kuṇi, the following names: Śvabhūti¹⁹, Vyāḍi, Māthura, Vararuci, Devanandin, Culli²⁰ Bhaṭṭi, Nirlūra²¹, Cūrṇi. Mīmāṃsaka's attempts to show that some of these authors are earlier than Patañjali must be considered to have failed.

V

5. The period in which grammarians felt free to make changes in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* and its appendices had come to a definite close in the time of the *Kāśikā*. We have seen (§§ 1.5; 2.1; 3.2) that the text of *Sūtrapāṭha*, *Gaṇapāṭha* and *Dhātupāṭha* was considered authoritative and unchangeable by the authors of the *Kāśikā*. This makes it all the more interesting that some features of the earlier period are still present in the *Kāśikā*.

¹⁹ Mīmāṃsaka (1973: I: 439) has 'Śvabhūti', which better fits his idea that this grammarian is earlier than Patañjali. No textual evidence supports this reading.

²⁰ Variants are Cūlli, Cunni, and perhaps Cūrṇi and Kuṇi which are listed separately.

²¹ Variant: Nallūra.

5.1. It is most interesting, no doubt, that the *Kāśikā* does not accept the final authority of Kātyāyana and Patañjali.²² This not only finds expression in the fact that the famous dictum *yathottaram muninām prāmāṇyam* is nowhere mentioned in the *Kāśikā* (Sharma, 1979: 5, n. 1). On a few occasions the *Kāśikā* explicitly disagrees with these two grammarians:²³

(i) On P. 8.1.67 the *Kāśikā* refers to an opinion of the Vārttikakāra according to which there is elision of *m* in the case of combinations of words falling under P. 8.1.67. The *Kāśikā* rejects this and explains that *m* is automatically dropped, where these combinations of words are compounds justified by their belonging to the gaṇa *mayūrvyaṃsakādi* (see P. 2.1.72). Where no compound-formation takes place, there *m* is not dropped. (II, p. 901: *malopas cal iti vārttikakāramataml mayūrvyaṃsakādityāt samāsaḥ/ samāse caitad anudāttatvam/ samāsāntodāttatvāpavāda iṣyatel dāruṇaṃ adhyāpakaḥ ity evamādiṣu na bhavatil malopas ca ity anenāpy ayam eva viṣaya ākhyāyate, yatra vibhakter abhāvāt makāro na śrūyate tatrānudāttatvam itil asamāse hi malopo naīveṣyatel.*) Note that the rejected opinion is accepted by Patañjali.

(ii) On P. 8.2.25 (*dhi ca*) the *Kāśikā* tells us that this sūtra and the following ones prescribe elision, not of just any *s*, but of *s* of the Aorist marker *sIC*. No elision of *s* takes therefore place in the derivation of *cakāddhi* (< *cakās-dhi*) and *payo dhāvati* (< *payas dhā-*). The *Kāśikā* then [383] continues (II, p. 915): *bhāṣyakāras tv āha, cakādhi ity eva bhavitavyam itil tena payo dhāvati ity evamādaṁ yatnāntaram āstheyaml.* (For a detailed discussion of this part of the *Kāśikā*, see Ojihara, 1962: 773-766 ((10)-(17)).)

Surprisingly, Patañjali's authority seems to be invoked in the *Kāśikā* on P. 7.1.12 (II, p. 775): *atijarasina, atijarasāt iti kecid icchantil yathā tu bhāṣye tathā naitad iṣyate iti lakṣyatell* "Some wish [to derive the forms] *atijarasina, atijarasāt* [with the help of P. 7.1.12]. It is, however, known that this is not so intended in the Bhāṣya."

5.2. On some occasions the *Kāśikā* gives variant readings of sūtras; see § 2.4 above. Changes elsewhere in Pāṇini's grammar are also indicated:

(i) Māheśvara sūtras 7 and 8 read: *ña ma ña ṇa na ml/ jha bha ñl*. The *Kāśikā* enumerates a number of Pratyāhāras ending in *m*, and then continues (I, p. 4): *kecit tu sarvāṇy etāni pratyāhāragrahaṇāni ñakāreṇa bhavantu iti makāram anubandhaṃ pratyācakṣatel.*

(ii) The gaṇa *sarvādi* (P. 1.1.27) contains *tva* twice over, with different accents. Some, however, read *tva tvat*, both with anudātta accent. (I, p. 14: *kecit takārāntam ekaṃ paṭhantil tva tvat iti dvāv api cānudāttau iti smarantil.*)

5.3. The above is by no means an exhaustive survey of what the *Kāśikā* has to offer us. A careful search may bring to light much that is of value for the history of Pāṇini's grammar. It

²² This is still true of Jinendrabuddhi's *Nyāsa*; see Bhim Sen Shastri, 1979: 421-22.

²³ A number of deviations from Patañjali in the *Kāśikā* can be found in chapter 7 (p. 173-207) of Mahesh Dutt Sharma, 1974.

is clear, however, that the *Kāśikā* has preserved traces from the earlier period in which Patañjali was not always considered authoritative and scholars felt free to improve upon Pāṇini's grammar by making changes in it.

VI

6.1. The preceding sections show that in all respects Pāṇini's grammar was affected in the period lying between Patañjali and Bhartṛhari: Sūtras were changed, as were the Dhātupāṭha and Gaṇapāṭha; commentaries were written which envisioned further "improvements" of the grammar. But we have not yet spoken about the study of paribhāṣās in the period under discussion.

It seems that in this particular field we are most fortunate of all. A [384] complete work has survived: the *Paribhāṣāvr̥tti* of Vyāḍi. We note that Jinendrabuddhi's *Nyāsa* on P. 7.2.11 (V, p. 679, l. 28-30) gives the opinion of a Vyāḍi regarding the interpretation of a Pāṇinian sūtra. There is therefore no reason to doubt that there was a grammarian in the Pāṇinian tradition at an early time who had the name 'Vyāḍi'.²⁴

We shall study a few passages from the *Paribhāṣāvr̥tti* which shed light on the position of this work in the history of Pāṇinian grammar. By way of introduction we observe that Vyāḍi's *Paribhāṣāvr̥tti* and Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* are not independent from each other. Both use similar, often identical, phrases (cf. Abhyankar, 1967: Intr., p. 11, 14), so that we may assume that one quoted from the other. Since, however, Vyāḍi does not mention Patañjali or the *Mahābhāṣya* by name²⁵, the opinion has been expressed that Vyāḍi's *Paribhāṣāvr̥tti* antedates the *Mahābhāṣya* (Abhyankar, 1967: Intr., p. 8, 12 f.). We shall see that this opinion cannot stand scrutiny.

6.2. Vyāḍi's *Paribhāṣāvr̥tti* on the Paribhāṣā *kṛtrimākṛtrimayoḥ kṛtime sampratyayaḥ* reads (p. 5, l. 23 - p. 6, l. 9 in Abhyankar's edition; Par. 5a, l. 1-30 in Wujastyk's edition; the text is Wujastyk's):

kṛtrimākṛtrimayoḥ kṛtime sampratyayaḥ/

*kṛtrimasya grahaṇe 'kṛtrimasya ca tatra kṛtime sampratyayo bhavati/
katham jñāyate/ yad ayaṁ mahārājāt thañ (P. 4.3.97) iti nipātayati/ atra hi
samāsāntasya tacāḥ pratiśedhaḥ na pūjanād (P. 5.4.69) iti/ etad ācāryaḥ paśyati suḥ
pūjāyām (P. 1.4.94) iti atir atikramaṇe ceti (P. 1.4.95) svatyor eva pūjītayor grahaṇam
bhavati/ iha na bhavati pratiśedhaḥ/*

²⁴ This Vyāḍi must be different from the person carrying this name mentioned by Kātyāyana, and probably from the Vyāḍi mentioned in the *Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya* (see Scharfe, 1977: 124-26, and Wezler, 1969: 19-23). This follows from the date we have to assign to the *Paribhāṣāvr̥tti*; see below.

²⁵ He does mention the Vārttikakāra a few times; for example in the passage given below, § 6.2.

naitad asti jñāpakam/ na hi svatī pūjāyām eva vihitau/ evaṃ tarhi na pūjanād (P. 5.4.69) iti grahaṇe svatyor eva grahaṇam/ āśrayigrahaṇād āśrayagrahaṇam api bhavati/ tena jñāpakam/

kim etasya jñāpane prayojanam/ mahārāja iti samāsāntaḥ siddho bhavati/ kṛtrimākṛtrimayoḥ kṛtime sampratyaya iti/

yeṣāṃ etat sūtram nāsti teṣāṃ eṣā paribhāṣā kim/ te bruvate/ kāṣṭhādiṣu svatī kalyāṇa iti kalyāṇagrahaṇam kimartham/ yāvat pūjanāt pūjitam (...; P. 8.1.67) ity atra pūjitaśabde kāṣṭhādayo nirdiśyante pūjane ye kāṣṭhādaya iti/ yadaiva svatī kalyāṇārthavācīṇau tadaiva pūjanam/ tasmān nārthaḥ kalyāṇagrahaṇena/ evaṃ [385] pratyākhyānasya prayojanam bruvate/ katham/ svatyoḥ kalyāṇavācīṇoḥ pūjanam iti samjñā syāt/ kim kṛtam bhavati/ na pūjanād (P. 5.4.69) ity atra vārttikakāreṇoktam svatyor grahaṇam kariavyam (cf. vt. 1 on P. 5.4.69) tan na vaktavyam bhavati/ evaṃ sati ye pūjanaśabdās tebhyo naiva pratiśedhaḥ prāpnoti/ tasmān nārthaḥ paribhāṣayā/ na ca prayojanam asti bhūyiṣṭham/

“[Par. 5a:] When something technical and something non-technical [can be understood by a term used in grammar], something technical is understood.

(I) Where something technical and something non-technical can be taken [as the meaning of a term in grammar], there the technical meaning is understood.

How is [this] known? Because he puts down as a special form [the word *mahārāja*] in [P. 4.3.97:] *mahārājāt thañ*. For here [there would be] prohibition of the ending [to be added] to the compound, viz., *TaC* (prescribed by P. 5.4.91), on account of [P. 5.4.69:] *na pūjanāt* (“compound-ending suffixes are not added after a compound the first member of which is *pūjana*”). The Ācārya sees this that only *su* and *ati*, when they are made to convey respect, are meant [by the word *pūjana* in P. 5.4.69], on account of [the two sūtras, P. 1.4.94:] *suḥ pūjāyām* (“*su* in the sense ‘respect’ is technically called *karmapravacanīyā*”) [and P. 1.4.95:] *atir atikramaṇe* (“*ati* in the sense ‘excellence’ is technically called *karmapravacanīyā*”). Here (in the compound *mahārāja*) the prohibition [embodied in P. 5.4.69] is not applicable.

[Objection:] This [can] not be the *jñāpaka*. For *su* and *ati* have not been prescribed exclusively in the sense ‘respect’. [Reply:] Such being the case, [the word *pūjana*] in P. 5.4.69:] *na pūjanāt* denotes *su* and *ati* in all their senses (*eva*). [This is possible because of the rule that] by taking something that resides in something else, one also takes that in which it resides. (I.e., by referring to the meaning *pūjana* ‘respect’ which resides in the words *su* and *ati*, one also refers to those two words irrespective of their meanings.) On account of that [the occurrence of *mahārāja* in P. 4.3.97 is] the *jñāpaka* [of our Paribhāṣā].

[Question:] What purpose [is served] in making known this [Paribhāṣā]?

[Answer:] The compound-ending [suffix *TaC*] is obtained for [the formation of] *mahārāja* with the help of [the Paribhāṣā] *kṛtrimākṛtrimayoḥ kṛtime sampratyayah*. [386]

(II) Those who do not have this sūtra (viz., P. 4.3.97: *mahārājāt thañ*), do they have this Paribhāṣā? They say: Why does the word *kalyāṇa* (‘beneficial’) occur among [the words] *kāṣṭhā* etc. (i.e., in the gaṇa *kāṣṭhādi* belonging to P. 8.1.67) in the form *svatī kalyāṇe* (“*su* and *ati* in the sense ‘beneficial’”)? Since in [P. 8.1.67:] *pūjanāt pūjitam* ... [the words] *kāṣṭhā* etc. are specified when a word denoting a respected [object] follows, [*kāṣṭhā* etc. must be understood to mean] ‘*kāṣṭhā* etc. when they have the meaning “respect” (*pūjana*)’. Only when *su* and *ati* are expressive of the meaning ‘beneficial’ (*kalyāṇa*), only then [can they be called] *pūjana*. Therefore, no aim [is served] by the use of [the word] *kalyāṇa* (‘beneficial’) [in the gaṇa *kāṣṭhādi*]. Such being the case, they say [what is] the purpose of the rejection [of the word *kalyāṇa*]. How? [It indicates that] the name of *su* and *ati*, when they are expressive of [the sense] ‘beneficial’ (*kalyāṇa*), be *pūjana*. What is the result? [The result is that] what has been said by the Vārttikakāra on [P. 5.4.69:] *na pūjanāt*, viz., that *su* and *ati* must be understood [by the term *pūjana*], that must not be said. [Because] if it were such [as the Vārttikakāra has it], there would not at all be prohibition [of compound-ending suffixes] after those words which are expressive of *pūjana* (‘respect’) [as prescribed in

P. 5.4.69]. Therefore no aim [is served] by the Paribhāṣā. And [it has] no purpose whatsoever.”

The above passage consists of two parts, (I) and (II). The first part finds a *jñāpaka* for the Paribhāṣā *kr̥trimākṛtrimayoḥ kr̥trime sampratyayaḥ* in the mention of the word *mahārāja* in P. 4.3.97: *mahārājāt thañ*. This word *mahārāja*, formed with the compound-ending suffix *ṬaC*, should not exist in view of P. 5.4.69 (*na pūjanāt*), which does not allow compound-ending suffixes to be added after compounds whose first member is a word expressive of respect. The conflict which thus exists between P. 5.4.69 and the word *mahārāja* in P. 4.3.97 is taken to indicate that P. 5.4.69, more precisely the word *pūjana* in it, has not been correctly understood. This word does not here carry the non-technical meaning “[words expressive of] respect”; it here refers to the words *su* and *ati*, in other words, it here has a technical meaning which can be determined on the basis of P. 1.4.94: *suḥ pūjāyām*, and P. 1.4.95: *atir atikramaṇe*. This part of the discussion contains nothing that is of special interest to us.

The second part discusses the opinion of “those who do not have this sūtra”. The sūtra intended cannot but be P. 4.3.97: *mahārājāt thañ*, for the [387] question regarding the basis of the Paribhāṣā in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* is discussed anew, this time without reference to P. 4.3.97. This provides us with some valuable information: in the time of Vyāḍi, there were grammarians who did not accept P. 4.3.97 as part of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*.

The fact is that P. 4.3.97 is accepted and commented upon in the *Kāśikā*, and has a corresponding sūtra in Candra’s grammar (Liebich, 1928; C. 3.3.63 reads: *tatra bhaktir mahārājāt thaṅ*). It is, however, significant that P. 4.3.97 has not been commented upon in Patañjali’s *Mahābhāṣya*, nor has it been used or mentioned anywhere in that work (Lahiri, 1935: 49; Birwé, 1966: 205).

The sequel of our passage has more surprises in store for us. It refers to the gaṇa *kāṣṭhādi*, more precisely, to the item *svatī kalyāṇe* which is said to occur in that gaṇa. The argument implies that this gaṇa was considered as referred to in P. 8.1.67, and that the actual gaṇa was made by Pāṇini. This corresponds with the *Kāśikā*, where P. 8.1.67 reads: *pūjanāt pūjitam anudāttaṃ kāṣṭhādibhyaḥ*.²⁶

However, the word *kāṣṭhādibhyaḥ* was not part of the sūtra at the time of Kātyāyana and Patañjali (Kielhorn, 1887: 182 (230)). It was added under the influence of Kātyāyana’s first vārttika on that sūtra, as Haradatta, the author of the commentary *Padamañjarī* (VI, p. 311) on the *Kāśikā*, already knew. The fact that Vyāḍi the author of the *Paribhāṣāvr̥tti* knew P. 8.1.67 in its later form with *kāṣṭhādibhyaḥ* is a clear indication that he lived a considerable time after Patañjali.

The next fact to be noted is that the item *svatī kalyāṇe*, which according to Vyāḍi is part of the gaṇa *kāṣṭhādi*, is not present in any surviving version of the gaṇa. The *Kāśikā* has *su* and *ati* in the gaṇa, but without indication as to their meaning. It is interesting that some Mss.

²⁶ This rule has no corresponding rule in Candra’s grammar, which has no rules on accent.

have *kalyāṇa* after *su* and *ati*, and therefore the sequence *su, ati, kalyāṇa* (see *Kāśikā* II, p. 901, fn. 9). It is easily seen that *su ati kalyāṇa* may be what was left of an earlier *svatī kalyāṇe*, or vice versa. We conclude that Vyāḍi's *Paribhāṣāvṛtti* made use of a reading in the Gaṇapāṭha different from any existing one, but one the existence of which is supported, be it indirectly, by some Mss. of the *Kāśikā*.

The last point that deserves our attention in the above passage is that the grammarians referred to by Vyāḍi are not afraid to disagree with the Vārttikakāra, i.e., Kātyāyana. They reject a vārttika (vt. 1 on P. 5.4.69) which clearly represents the *siddhānta* of Kātyāyana as well as Patañjali.

[388]

The above justifies the following conclusions:

- (1) Vyāḍi lived after Patañjali, for he knows a sūtra (P. 8.1.67) only in its post-Patañjalian form.
- (2) He lived before the *Kāśikā*, for he still has doubts regarding the authenticity of P. 4.3.97, which doubt no longer exists in the *Kāśikā*. He may even be earlier than Candra, who has a rule corresponding to P. 4.3.97. He seems to preserve the last portion of the gaṇa *kāṣṭhādi* in a form which has disappeared in the *Kāśikā*.
- (3) Like many of the Pāṇinian grammarians of his time, he knows Kātyāyana and Patañjali, but feels free to disagree with them.

6.3. We turn to a passage on the Paribhāṣā *saṃnipāṭalakṣaṇo vidhir animittam tadvighātasya* “(That which is taught in) a rule (the application of) which is occasioned by the combination (of two things), does not become the cause of the destruction of that (combination)” (tr. Kielhorn, 1974a: 410), which is nr. 10 in Abhyankar's edition, No. 7 in Wujastyk's edition. Vyāḍi discusses extensively the question of the purpose served by this Paribhāṣā. The last proposed answer to this question is discussed as follows (p. 7, l. 28 - p. 8, l. 7 in Abhyankar's ed.; Par. 7, l. 41-54 in Wujastyk's ed.; I follow Wujastyk):

idaṃ tarhi prayojanam/ śakaṭau paddhatau/ atra śakaṭI paddhatīti sthite idudbhyām (P. 7.3.117) *ity aukāre kṛte ac ca gher* (P. 7.3.119) *iti ca śakaṭipaddhatiśabdād akārāntād ata iti tāp prāpnoti/ tāpi ca yād āpa* (P. 7.3.113) *iti yāt syāt/ tatrāṇiṣṭam rūpam bhavati/ saṃnipāṭalakṣaṇo vidhir animittam tadvighātasyeti na doṣo bhavati/ atra hy aukārasaṃnipāṭajanitam adantatvam tad idānīm aukāravighātasyānimittam bhavati/ etad api nāsti prayojanam/ atrāpi hi ac ca gher* (P. 7.3.119) *iti samuccayakaraṇam²⁷ pratyākhyāya prayojanam ucyate tad evaṃ yathā syād yad anyat prāpnoti tan mā bhūd iti/ kiṃ ca prāpnoti/ tāb iti/ tasmāt prayojanam mṛgyam//*

“This then is the purpose: [to make possible the derivation of] *śakaṭau* (loc. sing. of *śakaṭi* ‘cart’), *paddhatau* (loc. sing. of *paddhati* ‘path’). Here, when we have *śakaṭi* and *paddhati*, when [subsequently] *au* [has been substituted for the ending *Ṇi*] by [P. 7.3.117:] *idudbhyām*, and [when then *a* has been substituted for the final *i* of *śakaṭi* and *paddhati*] on account of [P. 7.3.119:] *ac ca gher*, there would be [addition of the

²⁷ V.1.: *samuccayakaraṇam, attākaraṇam, atākaraṇam*; Abhyankar emends to *atākaraṇam*.

feminine suffix] [389] *TāP* after the word *śakaṭi* or *paddhati*, which [now] ends in *a*, [by P. 4.1.4: *ajādyataḥ tāp*] because [the word now ends in] short *a* (*aṭ*) [as required by that sūtra]. And when *TāP* is there, the augment *yāT* would be [added to *au* which replaces *Ōi*] by [P. 7.3.113:] *yāḍ āpah*. In that case an undesired form comes about. Owing to [the Paribhāṣā:] *saṃnipātālākṣaṇo vidhir animittam tadvighātasya*, no fault arises. For here the circumstance that [the word *śakaṭi* or *paddhati* now] ends in short *a* is brought about by the proximity of *au*; that [circumstance] does not now become the cause of the destruction of [that same sound] *au*.

This too is not the purpose. For here too, after rejecting the use of the two sounds [*aṭ* in the sūtra, where *a* would have sufficed, its] purpose is said to be that that which is applicable [after *a* has replaced *ghī*] should not take effect. And what is applicable? *TāP*. Therefore the purpose [of this Paribhāṣā] is [still] to be found.”

In order to elucidate the argument, I shall give the two derivations, the incorrect and the correct one, side by side, for *śakaṭi*.

Incorrect

śakaṭi-Ōi
śakaṭi-au, by P. 7.3.117
śakaṭa-au, by P. 7.3.119
śakaṭa-TāP-au, by P. 4.1.4
śakaṭa-ā-yāT-au, by P. 7.3.113
...

Correct

śakaṭi-Ōi
śakaṭi-au, by P. 7.3.117
śakaṭa-au, by P. 7.3.119
śakaṭau, by P. 6.1.88

Be it noted that in the incorrect derivation the suffix *au* is replaced by *yā-au*, i.e., ultimately by *yau*. This is the reason that *au* is ‘destroyed’, so that the present Paribhāṣā can come into action.

What interests us in this passage is the peculiar use that is made of P. 7.3.117 and 119. P. 7.3.117 is said to substitute *au* for *Ōi* in, say, *śakaṭi-i*; P. 7.3.119 is said to subsequently substitute *a* for final *i* of *śakaṭi*. We shall compare these statements with the *Kāśikā* and the *Mahābhāṣya* on these rules. They will be shown to fit neither.

The *Kāśikā* on P. 7.3.117-119 reads:

idudbhyām (P. 7.3.117)/*ikārokārābhyām nadīsañjñakābhyām uttarasya ñeḥ ām ādeśo bhavati/kr̥tyām/dhenvām/*

“In the place of [the loc. sing. suffix] *Ōi* which follows *i* and *u* that are [390] called *nadī* (in P. 1.4.3-6) comes the substitute *ām*. [Examples are:] *kr̥tyām* [out of *kr̥ti-Ōi*], *dhenvām* [out of *dhenu--Ōi*].”

aut (P. 7.3.118)/*idudbhyām uttarasya ñeḥ aukārādeśo bhavati/yan na nadīsañjñam nāpi ghisañjñam ikārāntam, tad ihodāharaṇam/sakhyau/patyau/*

“In the place of [the loc. sing. suffix] *Ōi* which follows *i* and *u*, comes the substitute *au*. What ends in *i* [but] is not called *nadī* [by P. 1.4.3-6, since these cases fall under P. 7.3.117,] nor is called *ghī* [by P. 1.4.7-9, since these case fall under P. 7.3.119], that is an example for this [sūtra. Instances are:] *sakhyau* [out of *sakhi-Ōi*], *patyau* [out of *pati-Ōi*].”

ac ca gheḥ (P. 7.3.119)/ *aut iti vartate/ ghisañjñakād uttarasya ñeḥ aukārādeśo bhavati, tasya ca gheḥ akārādeśo bhavati/ agnau/ vāyau/ kṛtau/ dhenau/ at iti taparakaraṇam striyām ṭāpo nivṛttyartham/ ...*

“*aut* is [valid in this sūtra from P. 7.3.118]. In the place of [the loc. sing. suffix] *Ñi* which follows what is called *ghi* (see P. 1.4.7-9), comes the substitute *au*, and in the place of that [preceding] *ghi* comes the substitute *a*. [Examples are:] *agnau* (< *agna-au* < *agni-Ñi*), *vāyau* (< *vāya-au* < *vāyu-Ñi*), *kṛtau* (< *kṛta-au* < *kṛti-Ñi*), *dhenau* (< *dhenau-au* < *dhenau-Ñi*), *paṭau* (< *paṭa-au* < *paṭu-Ñi*). The addition of *t* in *at* [in the sūtra] is in order to prevent [addition of] *ṬāP* in the feminine.”

We note, in passing, that the final sentence of the above portion of the *Kāśikā* shows that its author was aware of the problem also discussed by Vyāḍi, and solves it, as a matter of fact, in exactly the same way as Vyāḍi.

It will be clear that the *Kāśikā*, in the derivation of *śakaṭau*, does not need P. 7.3.117, merely P. 7.3.119. What is more, P. 7.3.117 cannot possibly play a role in this derivation, for P. 7.3.117 does not, and cannot, prescribe substitution of *au*. Substitution of *au* is prescribed in the two sūtras following P. 7.3.117, i.e., in P. 7.3.118 and 119.

I can see only one solution to the problem posed by Vyāḍi’s text: Vyāḍi read P. 7.3.117 and 118 together as one sūtra: *idudbhyām aut* “After short *i* and short *u*, *au* [in the place of *Ñi*]”.

[391]

But this is very revealing. For in the time of the *Mahābhāṣya* the *three* sūtras P. 7.3.117-119 formed one single sūtra (Kielhorn, 1887: 180 (228)). In the time of the *Kāśikā*, as we have seen, the originally single sūtra *idudbhyām aut ac ca gheḥ* had been split into three and they were to remain like that ever since. Interestingly, the *Kāśikā* still knows of people who looked upon *aud ac ca gheḥ* as a single sūtra.²⁸ The last sentence of the comments on P. 7.3.119 begins: *aud ac ca gheḥ iti yeṣām ekam evedaṃ sūtram ...* “Those who think that *aud ac ca gheḥ* is but a single sūtra ...”. It is even more interesting that Candra’s grammar contains in C. 6.2.59, 61, 62 equivalents to the *three* sūtras of the *Kāśikā*.

It seems safe to conclude that we have found another indication that Vyāḍi’s *Paribhāṣāṣvṛtti* belongs to the little known period following Patañjali, and preceding the *Kāśikā* and Candra.

6.4. If the above considerations are correct, Vyāḍi’s *Paribhāṣāṣvṛtti* represents one of the very interesting documents of the history of Pāṇinian grammar. It may well be the only surviving text from the unknown period in which Patañjali’s *Mahābhāṣya* was not yet taken as the final authority, a period, none the less, in which changes — we don’t know how many or how great

²⁸ Patañjali (III, p. 342, l. 7-16), following Kātyāyana, proposes *yogavibhāga*, first of *idudbhyām aud ac ca gheḥ* into *idudbhyām* and *aud ac ca gheḥ*, then of *aud ac ca gheḥ* into *aut* and *ac ca gheḥ*. This need not, of course, imply that in those days *aud ac ca gheḥ* was looked upon as one sūtra.

— were introduced in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* and all that accompanies it. It needs no argument that Vyāḍi's *Paribhāṣāvṛtti* deserves to be studied closely.

Such a study cannot be undertaken here. It is being undertaken by Dr. Dominik Wujastyk, who already finished (in Ms.) a critical edition of Vyāḍi's text. Let us hope that the results of his labours will be published soon.

VII

7.1. If we sum up what we have found so far, we can say that the period before Bhartṛhari — and, we may add, before Candra — saw great activity on the part of Pāṇinian grammarians. This activity, however, was different from what came to be accepted practice in later times. In these early days Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* was certainly studied; but it was not considered the final authority as it was later. One could say that the work of Pāṇini and Patañjali was continued. Suggestions made by Patañjali were turned into reality where the later grammarians found them acceptable. Others were rejected. Pāṇini's grammar was made 'up to date' by way of *iṣṭis* and [392] *upasaṃkhyānas* in the commentaries, but also — to an extent which unfortunately we cannot get to know — by changes and additions in *Sūtra*-, *Dhātu*- and *Gaṇapāṭha*.

Regarding the period here studied we possess one explicit description in some verses of Bhartṛhari's *Vākyapadīya*.²⁹ The verses are rather obscure, and much has been written about their correct interpretation.³⁰ It will be interesting to study them afresh against the background of our newly acquired information. We have the additional advantage that we can make use of Rau's recent critical edition of the *Vākyapadīya*, which differs in some crucial respects from the text used by all who wrote about these verses.

I shall first give the verses together with a translation (§ 7.2). Subsequently I shall discuss the reading adopted (§ 7.3) and the interpretation given (§ 7.4), which will then be supported by further evidence.

7.2. *Vākyapadīya* 2.481-486 reads:

- 2.481: *prāyeṇa saṃkṣeparucīn alpavidyāparigrahān/
saṃprāpya vaiyākaraṇān saṃgrāhe 'stam upāgate//*
2.482: *kṛte 'tha pātāñjalinā guruṇā tīrthadarśinā/*

²⁹ These verses may have been written, not by Bhartṛhari, but by one of his students; see Aklujkar, 1978: 11-16. This does not, however, affect their value as historical evidence.

³⁰ The list of modern authors who dealt with these verses almost reads like a Who is Who in the study of Pāṇini: Goldstücker (1860: 257-58), Weber (1862: 158-68), Bhandarkar (1873), Kielhorn (1874b, 1875, 1876, 1885: 188-90 (191-93)), Peterson (1885: 181-83), Thieme (1956: 18-20 (590-92)), Mīmāṃsaka (1973: I: 341, 348-49,

- sarveṣāṃ nyāyabījānāṃ mahābhāṣye nibandhane//*
- 2.483: *alabdhaḡādhe gāmbhīryād uttāna iva sauṣṭhavāt/
tasminn akṛtabuddhīnāṃ naivāvāsthita niścayaḡ//*
- 2.484: *vaijisaubhavaḡaryakṣaiḡ śuṣkatarkānusāribhiḡ/
ārṣe viplāvite granthe saṡgrahapratikañcuke//*
- 2.485: *yaḡ pātañjaliśiṣyebhyo bhraṣṭo vyākaraṡāḡamaḡ/
kālena dākṣtiṡātyeṣu granthamātro vyavasthitaḡ//*
- 2.486: *parvatād āḡamaṡ labdhvā bhāṣyabījānusāribhiḡ/
sa nīto bahuśāḡhatvaṡ candrācāryādibhiḡ punaḡ//*

“[481:] When the *Samgraha*, upon reaching grammarians who in general liked abridgements and possessed little knowledge, had ceased to be studied,
[482-83:] subsequently definite knowledge [regarding the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*] was not, according to [scholars] who did not use their intellect, to be found in the *Mahābhāṣya*, [a work] which had been composed by the guru Patañjali, thoroughly versed in different systems of knowledge, [the *Mahābhāṣya*] which is the basis of all sources of interpretational principles, which is unfathomable on account of its depth [but all the same] appearing shallow on account of its excellence.

[393]

[484:] When the work of the *ṛṣi* (Pāṇini), of which the defensive armour (*pratikañcuka*) [had been] the *Samgraha*, had been mutilated by Vaiji, Saubhava and Haryakṣa, because [in trying to understand it] they had followed their bare reasoning [not taking Patañjali’s views as authoritative],

[485-86:] the traditional knowledge of grammar — which, in the course of time, in the south, had fallen from the pupils of Patañjali, [and] existed [there] only in the form of the book (i.e., the *Mahābhāṣya*) — was made by Candrācārya and others, who followed the seed-like Bhāṣya, into a many-branched [tree] again, after they had obtained the [correct] traditional knowledge from the mountain-range (Himālaya?).”

7.3. The verses from the *Vākyapadīya* have here been reproduced as they appear in Rau’s critical edition, with one exception. In verse 486d, Rau’s edition has *cāndrā*. A note indicates that one of the two hyparchetypes (n) had *candrā*. This latter reading seems to make more sense against the background of what we know regarding Candra’s close adherence of Patañjali’s *Mahābhāṣya*, even in his own grammar.

The form *cāndra*, apparently for *candra*, is in a remarkable way parallel to *pātañjali*, which occurs twice in our passage (482a; 485a). That here Patañjali is meant follows from verse 482, where Pātañjali is said to have composed the *Mahābhāṣya*. Rau notes no variants

for 482a, and but few occurrences of *patañjali* in the Mss. for 485a. We must therefore assume that the reading *pātañjali* is original,³¹ being a variant of *patañjali*, and not meaning “descendants of the descendants of Patañjali” (Thieme, 1956: 19 (591); cf. Cardona, 1978: 82 n. 7).

The most important deviation from the text as it has almost always been discussed, occurs in 485c: the critical edition has *kālena*, the version discussed by most earlier authors has *kāle sa*. The latter reading seems, at first sight, preferable (Aklujkar, 1978: 10 n. 6), but a closer inspection shows this first impression to be wrong. If the reading *kāle sa* is accepted, *sa* must correspond to *yaḥ* in 485a, and verse 485 becomes a syntactically closed unit. The result is that verse 486 becomes ungrammatical in the way discussed by Aklujkar (1978: 23; 1981: 584 f.) who observes that “either the accusative *āgamam* or the nominative *saḥ* must be given up if 486 is to contain a construction worthy of a grammarian author”. Rau’s Mss. and Aklujkar’s observation together leave little doubt that *kālena* is the correct reading.

Earlier authors read in 485c *granthamātre*. Rau’s reading *granthamātro* [394] *vyavasthitaḥ* has, as was pointed out to me by Prof. P. Thieme, a parallel in the second *Parīṣiṣṭa* to the *Nirukta* (ed. Roth, p. 192): ... *sa brahmabhūto bhavati sākṣimātro vyavatiṣṭhate* ... “he becomes equal to Brahman and exists only as witness”.

7.4. The interpretation here given of the six verses of the *Vākyapadīya* leans, of course, heavily on the results of the investigations of earlier authors (see note 30). I shall here focus attention on such aspects of my interpretation which deviate from earlier opinions, and on questions which had remained unresolved but now seem to allow of a solution.

By way of introduction it must be stated that the verses from Kalhaṇa’s *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, which have often been discussed in combination with the verses of the *Vākyapadīya*, and which seem to throw light upon the latter, do not deserve to be looked upon in this way. Kalhaṇa lived at least 500 years after Bhartṛhari, and cannot be considered an authority regarding what happened before Bhartṛhari. See in this connection already Peterson, 1885: 181, and Thieme, 1956: 20 (592) n. 48. Also Puṇyarāja’s (?) explanation of the verses of the *Vākyapadīya* does not merit unreserved confidence (cf. Aklujkar, 1982).

The most important information which we draw from verses 481-83 is that, after the *Samgraha* had ceased to be studied, people no longer considered Patañjali’s *Mahābhāṣya* authoritative. This information, which can be read in these verses, is abundantly confirmed by the evidence collected in the earlier sections of this article. Not that by taking *kr̥te* ... *mahābhāṣye nibandhane alabdhaḡādhe* ... *uttān[e]* not as a locative absolute, but as being in apposition with *tasmin* (which interpretation is grammatically preferable), verses 481-83 do not imply that the *Mahābhāṣya* was composed after the *Samgraha* had ceased to be studied.

and Roodbergen (1976: i-xii, xix, xxxii-xxxiii), Aklujkar (1978, 1981, 1982), Cardona (1978).

³¹ Weber (1862: 147 n) gives some reasons to prefer ‘Pātañjali’ to ‘Patañjali’.

The *ārṣa grantha* of verse 484 must be Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. We have found ample evidence that the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* and its appendices were 'mutilated' in the period before Bhartṛhari, and even that Bhartṛhari was aware of that (§ 2.5). We found, on the other hand, no reason to think that the *Mahābhāṣya* had been mutilated. Since, according to verse 481, the trouble started when the *Samgraha* had ceased to be studied, the *Samgraha* had apparently been the "defensive armour" of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. This interpretation of the word *pratikañcuka*, by Thieme (1956: 19 (591)), can therefore be maintained in spite of criticism by Aklujkar (1978: 19-23).

[395]

Verse 484 enumerates the names of three grammarians who followed their bare reasoning: Vaiji, Saubhava and Haryakṣa. We may assume that they commented upon, and at the same time changed, the text of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* in the manner with which we are now familiar. These three names do not recur anywhere in the extant grammatical literature of India, as far as I know. One notices the relatedness of 'Saubhava' and 'Subhūti', a variant of 'Śvabhūti' (§ 4.3, above).

7.5. Verses 485-86 deserve particularly close attention because they seem to have been misinterpreted in an essential way by all except Scharfe (1976: 276). All others thought that verse 485 tells us that the grammatical tradition existed only in books *only in the south*; verse 486 was then taken to mean that Candra had to get these books from a particular mountain (or person) in the south.

All this is unacceptable. We do not know exactly which books were part of the grammatical tradition meant by Bhartṛhari (see however § 7.6, below). It is certain that the *Mahābhāṣya* was one (perhaps the only one) of them. The preceding sections of this article show that the *Mahābhāṣya* was extensively studied in the time preceding Candra. It is therefore impossible to believe that the *Mahābhāṣya* led a moribund existence somewhere on a mountain in the south. Rather, verses 485-86 tell us that the Patañjalian oral tradition had disappeared in the south, but survived in the north. To reintroduce this oral tradition in the south, Candra had to travel to the mountain-range in the north, which is, most probably, the Himālaya, the mountain-range *par excellence*.

Before we consider some more evidence which supports this interpretation, we note that our verses do not say that at a certain time there was no grammatical tradition at all. Rather, they claim that, primarily in the south, this tradition had fallen from the pupils of Patañjali. In view of what we have learned in the preceding sections, there is no reason to doubt that the Pāṇinian tradition had come into the hands of others who studied the *Mahābhāṣya* but were not pupils of Patañjali, in the sense that they did not consider him the final authority on Pāṇini's grammar.

Our interpretation of verses 485-486 seems to imply that Candrar lived in the south. And since Bhartrhari seems to belong to the tradition which had been revived by Candrar, he too may have lived in the south. There is some evidence in support of both.

[396]

Rau (1980; see also Bronkhorst, 1981a, and Rau, 1981) has shown, on the basis of the Vedic quotations in the *Vākyapadīya* and *Mahābhāṣyadīpikā*, “that Bhartrhari was more familiar with the sacred lore of [the Maitrāyaṇīya] branch of the Black Yajurveda than with that of any other Vedic School: he may, indeed, have been a Maitrāyaṇīya” (p. 180). If Bhartrhari was a Maitrāyaṇīya, we are in a position to say something about his probable place of residence. Maitrāyaṇīyas are known to have lived (and still live) primarily in Gujarat and the region of the river Godāvarī in north Mahārāṣṭra, further in the south of Madhya Pradesh, Bengal and Orissa (Schroeder, 1881: XXII-XXV; Renou, 1947: 199, 203; Witzel, 1981 f.: § 1.5, §2.3; notes 198, 199, 200, 204, 205, 283, 284). Assuming then that Bhartrhari lived in the south, i.e., south of the Vindhya range, his most likely area was the region extending from Gujarat to the area of Nasik in Mahārāṣṭra. This conjecture finds some support in what we know about Candrar’s region.

The only information we have about Candrar’s locality has been discovered by Hartmut Scharfe (1976). It is obtained by means of an “index fossil”, as Scharfe (borrowing the term from Liebich) calls it. Since, however, Scharfe overlooked an important point, and therefore drew a partially incorrect conclusion, we shall study the evidence anew.

Candrar’s grammar, following Pāṇini’s, introduces two groups of future suffixes, represented by *lṛt* (first future) and *luṭ* (second future) respectively. *lṛt* expresses future events in general (C. 1.3.2: *bhaviṣyati lṛt*), *luṭ* those that do not take place that same day (C. 1.3.3: *anadyatane luṭ*). The Vṛtti on C. 1.3.106 gives some additional information about the correct use of the two groups of future suffixes (p. 114, l. 21 - p. 115, l. 1; p. 115, l. 6-8):

bhaviṣyati maryādāvacane ‘varasmin pravibhāge sannikarsakhyāpanaparatvād vivakṣāyā luṭ na bhavati/yo ‘yam adhvā gantavya ā pāṭaliputrāt tasya yad avaram kauśāmbhyās tatraudanam bhokṣyāmahe/... maryādāvacanābhāve... viprakarsaparatvād vivakṣāyā anadyatanavidhir bhavaty eva/yo ‘yam adhvā niravadhiko gantavyas tasya yad avaram kauśāmbhyās tatraudanam bhoktāmahe/

“For a future [event], if a limit is expressed, *luṭ* is not [used] with respect to the nearby part, because the intention is to express proximity. [An example is:] ‘The road that must be traversed to Pāṭaliputra — on the part of it which is this side of Kauśāmbī we shall eat (*bhokṣyāmahe*; first future) [397] rice’. ... If no limit is expressed, the rule regarding ‘not that same day’ (C. 1.3.3) is certainly [applied], because distance is intended to be expressed. [An example is:] ‘The limitless road that must be traversed — on the part of it which is this side of Kauśāmbī we shall eat (*bhoktāmahe*; second future) rice’.”

We are interested in the examples given in this passage. They show, as Scharfe correctly saw, that Candrar, when he wanted to travel to Pāṭaliputra, had to pass through Kauśāmbī. He must

therefore have lived somewhere to the west of Kauśāmbī. What Scharfe failed to see is that, for these examples to make sense, Candra must have lived a considerable distance from Kauśāmbī, far more than could possibly be traversed in a single day. Only then is the first example a convincing exception to the rule that *luṭ* must be used for a future event that does not take place that same day; and only then can Candra say regarding the second example that this rule must certainly be applied.

From which parts of India, not too close to Kauśāmbī, would one travel to Pāṭaliputra through Kauśāmbī? Kauśāmbī lay on the main road which connected Pāṭaliputra with Mathurā³² and further the northwest of India (Pāṇini's *uttarapatha*; P. 5.1.77). It is more interesting that in Kauśāmbī the main road from the south³³ joined the northern road (Schwartzberg, 1978: 19, 24). That is to say, for everyone travelling from Ujjayinī or beyond to Pāṭaliputra, Kauśāmbī would be the most important stop after a long journey through the Vindhya forests. This means that an assumed residence of Candra in Gujarat or north Mahārāṣṭra would fit his examples extraordinarily well.

We conclude that, even if certainty is beyond reach, the data which we possess regarding the residence of Candra and Bhartṛhari favour the western part of India, just south of the Vindhyas.

7.6. A few more remarks about verses 485-86 must be made. I analyze the compound *bhāṣyabīja* in accordance with P. 2.1.56, so that it comes to mean: "seed-like Bhāṣya". This seems to do most justice to the other simile in the verse, according to which the grammatical tradition was made into a many-branched tree. Since the *Mahābhāṣya* is part, even the centre, of this grammatical tradition (see § 6.5, above), the two similes fit very well together.

In order to understand what is meant by the "many-branched [tree]" of [398] 486c, we may recall Kielhorn's (1883: 26-27) remark regarding Bhartṛhari's *Mahābhāṣyadīpikā*: "In fact, I know of few grammarians who so frequently quote the opinion of others as he [i.e., Bhartṛhari] does ..." It appears that in Bhartṛhari's time the grammatical tradition based on Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* led a vigorous life, that many interpretations were proposed and studied.

Kielhorn continues the above remark, saying: "nothing is more to be regretted than that he [i.e., Bhartṛhari] should have introduced those opinions by such vague expressions as *eke varṇayanti*, *anye varṇayanti*, *apare varṇayanti*, *anyeṣāṃ darśanam*, *apareṣāṃ vyākhyānam*, etc., and should not have recorded the names of the scholars to whom he must have been

³² This means that someone from Mathurā would travel to Pāṭaliputra through Kauśāmbī, not through Sāketa, as Patañjali the author of the *Mahābhāṣya* would (Mb. II, p. 162, l. 6-12; on P. 3.3.136). Patañjali cannot, therefore, have lived "either in Mathurā or not far from it", as Scharfe (1976: 274) thinks. For maps, see Schwartzberg, 1978: 19 Plate III.B.5 and 24 Plate III.C.5a.

³³ This road may have been the original *dakṣiṇāpatha* (lit. "southern road"). This term came to designate initially a small region in the south, later the south in general. It is interesting that the region initially called *dakṣiṇāpatha* was "a remote settlement or colony on the banks of the upper Godhāvarī [= Godāvārī]" (Rhys Davids, 1903: 30;

indebted for his own learning.” This vagueness, be it noted, prevails primarily where the *Mahābhāṣya* is explained. With regard to the interpretation of sūtras Bhartṛhari is more concrete; he speaks of Vṛttikāras, i.e., authors of books, and mentions Kuṇi by name (§ 2.5, above).

It is tempting to conclude from the above that Bhartṛhari was the first to write a commentary on the *Mahābhāṣya*. He could make use of opinions expressed and discussed in a clearly interested generation of grammarians. But conceivably these opinions were expressed only orally, and did not, for that reason, become closely associated with certain individuals. It is certain that no clear indications have been found anywhere that earlier commentaries than Bhartṛhari’s on the *Mahābhāṣya* existed.

But if indeed no earlier commentaries on the *Mahābhāṣya* existed, the written part of the “grammatical tradition kept by the pupils of Patañjali” consisted of no more than the text of the *Mahābhāṣya*. If then, in the south, the Patañjalian tradition had been reduced to books alone, this means that only Mss. of the *Mahābhāṣya* had remained.

VIII

8. From the above considerations we can safely conclude that the early centuries following Patañjali saw a rather great activity in the Pāṇinian school of grammar. This activity was for an important part aimed at improving Pāṇini’s grammar and did not shy away from making material changes in all parts of this grammar. We have evidence of changes in and additions to Sūtra-, Gaṇa- and Dhātupāṭha.

Interestingly, many of these changes were apparently made under the [399] influence of Patañjali’s *Mahābhāṣya*. Indeed, there is no evidence whatever that the study of Patañjali’s work was in any way neglected during this period. We do, however, have reason to believe that the *Mahābhāṣya* was not looked upon as the final authority in matters grammatical. Often the changes introduced in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* and its appendices follow Patañjali to some extent, but not all the way.

There is, unfortunately, no way of deciding the extent to which changes were introduced in Pāṇini’s grammar. The *Mahābhāṣya* is really all we have to go by. Where the *Mahābhāṣya* is silent, we are left in the dark. In the cases of sūtras, we can still ask in how far it is possible to remove one or more of them from its (their) context without making what remains unintelligible. In the end we are left with a great number of sūtras and entries in the Dhātu- and Gaṇapāṭha that *may*, wholly or partly, be post-Patañjalian additions.³⁴

cf. Malalasekera, 1937: 1050-51, s.v. Dakṣiṇāpatha). This region — the south *par excellence* — is also the one in or near which we suspect Candra and Bhartṛhari to have lived.

³⁴ Liebig (1928: 49) concludes his concordance Pāṇini-Candra with the words: “... die Kondordanz [liefert] den unumstößlichen Beweis dafür, dass Panini’s Sūtrapāṭha, von ein Paar verschwindenden Fällen abgesehen, im

All this shows that the opinion according to which the Pāṇinian system stopped developing with Patañjali,³⁵ needs rethinking. It rather seems that the development went on, and determined — to an extent that can no longer be ascertained — the form of Pāṇini's grammar as we know it, in spite of efforts by later grammarians to return to Pāṇini.

APPENDIX I: JAYĀDITYA AND VĀMANA

The *Kāśikā*³⁶ is known to contain internal inconsistencies. This is traditionally explained by saying that the *Kāśikā* had two authors, Jayāditya and Vāmana. In this appendix I shall show that this explanation is unsatisfactory, and that another explanation is possible. It will further be shown that the double authorship itself is open to doubt.

Jinendrabuddhi's *Nyāsa*, the oldest commentary on the *Kāśikā*, mentions Jayāditya and Vāmana on a few occasions.

- (i) The *Nyāsa* on P. 1.1.5 (I, p. 85, l. 14-30) notes a contradiction between the *Kāśikā* on P. 1.1.5 and P. 3.2.139 on the one hand, and the *Kāśikā* on P. 7.2.11 on the other. It quotes the *Kāśikā* on P. 3.2.139 and ascribes it to Jayāditya; it also quotes the *Kāśikā* on P. 7.2.11 and ascribes it to Vāmana. It further makes a mention of a *Vṛtti* by Jayāditya on P. 7.2.11, to which it ascribes a position which is in accord with the *Kāśikā* on P. 3.2.139.
- (ii) The *Nyāsa* on P. 3.1.33 (II, p. 410, l. 28 - p. 411, l. 27) notes a contradiction between the *Kāśikā* on P. 3.1.33 and the *Kāśikā* on P. 7.1.58. [400] It ascribes the *Kāśikā* on P. 3.1.33 to Jayāditya, and the *Kāśikā* on P. 7.1.58 (which it quotes) to Vāmana. It further refers to Jayāditya's commentary on P. 6.4.22, in a way which does not allow us to make sure if our *Kāśikā* is meant or not.³⁷

It has been concluded from the above (and from remarks in other, later, grammatical works) that both Jayāditya and Vāmana commented upon the whole of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, but that the *Kāśikā* as we know it consists of parts from these two commentaries joined together (cf. Ojihara, 1961: 753 ((11))).

fünften Jahrhundert n. Chr. Bereits den und bekanntent Inhalt hatte." This is not much of a consolation, for in Candra's time the harm had been done already.

One rule that is almost certain to be a later addition is P. 4.1.117 (*vikarṇaśuṅgacchagalād vatsabharadvājātriṣu*), since it mentions the Śuṅgas, who ruled in northern India long after Pāṇini. P. 4.1.117 is not mentioned or used in the *Mahābhāṣya*, and can be removed with impunity. Another such rule may be P. 1.4.106; see Sarma, date unknown: 56-57.

³⁵ Cf. Rau, 1979: 159: "Er [= Patañjali] brachte das pāṇineische System der Sanskritgrammatik zum Abschluss, sein magnum opus wurde in der Folgezeit nur noch kommentiert ..., nicht mehr weitergebildet."

³⁶ It is worth while to recall Mazumdar's (1912) observation that the name *Kāśikā* does not prove that this commentary was composed in *Kāśī*, i.e., Benares, as Haradatta maintains in his *Padamañjarī* (I, p. 6, l. 7-8). *Kāśikā* may simply mean 'illuminating'. Cf. Śṛṣṭidhara's remark *kāśayati prakāśayati sūtrārtham iti kāśikā* (cited in Mahesh Dutt Sharma, 1974: 20).

³⁷ On P. 3.1.78 (II, p. 457, l. 22-25) the *Nyāsa* refers to the *Kāśikā* on P. 6.4.23 and describes it as that what the *Vṛttikāra* himself will say. This supports the view that in Jinendrabuddhi's opinion the *Kāśikā* on Adhyāyas 3 and 6 — and therefore probably on the first six Adhyāyas — was written by one person, viz., Jayāditya.

There is no unanimity regarding who wrote what. The Ms. tradition of Kashmir ascribes the first four Adhyāyas to Jayāditya, the remaining four to Vāmana; Haridīkṣita ascribes Adhyāyas 1, 2, 5 and 6 to Jayāditya, the remaining ones to Vāmana; while most Mss. tend to make the division after Adhyāya 5: what comes before it it Jayāditya's, the rest Vāmana's (Ojihara, 1961: 753 ((11))).

Difficulties arise once we look at other inconsistencies in the *Kāśikā*. Ojihara (1961, 1962, 1964) discusses some:

- (i) between the *Kāśikā* on P. 1.1.57 and on P. 6.4.19 (1961: 751-749 ((13)-(15)));
- (ii) between the *Kāśikā* on P. 1.1.58 and P. 6.4.100 on the one hand, and on P. 8.2.26 on the other (1962);
- (iii) between the *Kāśikā* on P. 1.1.68 and on P. 4.4.35 (1964).

Further inconsistencies came to light in the present article:

- (i) between the *Kāśikā* on P. 4.1.18 and on P. 4.1.105 (§ 3.2.1, above);
- (ii) between the *Kāśikā* on P. 8.4.7 and on P. 8.4.11 (§ 3.2.2, above);
- (iii) between the *Kāśikā* on P. 6.1.63 and on P. 4.2.80 (§ 3.2.3, above);
- (iv) between the *Kāśikā* on P. 4.1.74 and on P. 4.1.80 (§ 3.2.4, above);
- (v) between the *Kāśikā* on P. 1.1.37 and on P. 1.1.38-41 (§ 2.5, above).

It is clear that it is virtually impossible to divide the *Kāśikā* in such a way that no inconsistencies remain in the portions to be ascribed to Jayāditya resp. Vāmana. One wonders if the whole story was not invented in order to explain away at least some of the inconsistencies.

The most likely person to have proposed this solution is Jinendrabuddhi, the author of the *Nyāsa*, probably the first commentary on the *Kāśikā*. We have seen that on at least two occasions Jinendrabuddhi indeed refers to Jayāditya and Vāmana in order to explain a contradiction.

The fact that the colophons of the *Kāśikā* mention Jayāditya sometimes and Vāmana sometimes presents no problem. These colophons may have [401] been added under the influence of the commentary *Nyāsa*. It can be proved that the *Nyāsa* exerted a profound influence on even the text tradition of the *Kāśikā*, in the following manner: The Mss. of the *Kāśikā* are unanimous in giving as second introductory verse:

*iṣṭyupasaṁkhyānavatī śuddhagaṇā vivṛtagūḍhasūtrārthā /
vyutpannarūpasiddhir vṛttir iyaṁ kāśikā nāma //*

The verse also occurs at the very end of the *Kāśikā*. Did it occur twice over from the beginning? Clearly not. The *Nyāsa* quotes it after the first introductory verse, saying (I, p. 5, l. 30-32): *tathā ca vakṣyati śāstrānte: iṣṭyupasaṁkhyānavatī ...* “And he'll say thus at the end of the book: *iṣṭyupasaṁkhyānavatī ...*”. Apparently this verse got into all the Mss. of the *Kāśikā* from the *Nyāsa*. Is it then surprising that the names ‘Jayāditya’ and ‘Vāmana’ got into the

colophons on account of some statements in the *Nyāsa*? The fact that the Mss. widely differ from each other in the actual distribution of these names over the Pādas further supports this view.

Where then did the idea of a double authorship of the *Kāśikā* come from? Perhaps I-ching's account of the Sanskrit grammarians can shed light on this question.

I-ching (see Takakusu, 1896: 175-78) does not directly mention the *Kāśikā*. He does mention a *Vṛtti-sūtra* and ascribes it to Jayāditya (Brough, 1973: 255). He further maintains that Patañjali's *Cūrṇi* (= *Mahābhāṣya*) is a commentary on the *Vṛtti-sūtra*.

There can be no doubt that there is much confusion in this account. The context shows that by 'Vṛtti-sūtra' the *vārttikas* are meant (Brough, 1973: 256). But the *vārttikas* were written by Kātyāyana, not by Jayāditya.

Here, however, it must be observed that many of Kātyāyana's *vārttikas* and other *vārttika*-like statements³⁸ (*iṣṭis* and *upasaṃkhyānas*) are present in our *Kāśikā*. Could it be that they were collected, and some of them even composed, by Jayāditya? In that case I-ching's confusion becomes understandable: Both Kātyāyana and Jayāditya were somehow responsible for a collection of *vārttikas*. Kātyāyana's *vārttikas* were commented upon in Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya*; Jayāditya's '*vārttikas*' were incorporated into a *Vṛtti*, the *Kāśikā-Vṛtti*, and could therefore be called '*Vṛtti-sūtra*'.³⁹ The size of 18 000 ślokas, which I-ching assigns to the '*Vṛtti-sūtra*', must of course be understood to apply to the combination '*Vṛtti-sūtra*' + *Vṛtti*, i.e., to the *Kāśikā* as a whole.

[402]

Let it be admitted that the above is somewhat speculative. But it cannot be denied that it clears up a number of obscure points. Not only I-ching's account gains in intelligibility, it also becomes clear why the names of two authors are connected with the *Kāśikā*: Jayāditya wrote the '*vārttikas*' or even '*vṛtti-sūtras*', Vāmana the remainder of the commentary.⁴⁰

How do we now explain the inconsistencies in the *Kāśikā*? A number of them turned out to be due to the reluctance on the part of the author(s?) of the *Kāśikā* to deviate from what they received from tradition. Is it not likely that all the inconsistencies must be explained in this way? The *Kāśikā*, bringing together material from different sources, never bothered to remove the inconsistencies which existed between the sources, or even found inconsistencies in each of its sources, as may have been the case in the commentary on P. 1.1.37-41 (see § 2.5, above).

³⁸ Vedpati Mishra (1970: 145-52) enumerates the *vārttikas* of the *Kāśikā* which are not, or not in that form, found in the *Mahābhāṣya*.

³⁹ This use of the term deviates from Patañjali's use of it; see Brough, 1973: 256.

⁴⁰ Of course, another possibility is that Vāmana and Jayāditya are two names for one and the same person, as Colebrooke and Bālaśāstrin thought (Müller, 1880: 306). But this would leave I-ching's account unintelligible.

APPENDIX II: ŚABARA AND PATAÑJALI

There has been some controversy regarding the chronological relationship between Śabara, the author of the *Mīmāṃsābhāṣya*, the extensive commentary on the *Mīmāṃsāsūtras*, and Patañjali, the author of the (*Vyākaraṇa*-) *Mahābhāṣya*; see Devasthali, 1942, 1949, 1951; Kane, 1922, 1945; and Garge, 1952: 23-25. The remarkable fact is that Śabara mentions Pāṇini and Kātyāyana by name, but not Patañjali. Pāṇini is mentioned under *Mīmāṃsāsūtras* 1.1.5; 10.6.5 and 10.8.4; Kātyāyana under *sūtra* 10.8.4.

However, even though Patañjali's name is never mentioned in the *Mīmāṃsābhāṣya*, phrases from his *Mahābhāṣya* are quoted therein. Garge (1952: 23-25) discusses ten such cases.

In spite of this, there are indications that Patañjali and Kātyāyana had not reached by the time of the *Mīmāṃsābhāṣya* the position of respect which they obtained later. The first one is, of course, that neither Patañjali nor his *Mahābhāṣya* is ever mentioned by name. Another one has been pointed out by Devasthali (1949: 233, 236 f.). It concerns Śabara's dissolution of the compound *dharmajijñāsā* in *sūtra* 1.1.1; it is: *dharmāya jijñāsā* (I, p. 2). This does not necessarily conflict with Pāṇini's grammar, nor with Kātyāyana's interpretation of it. It does, however, conflict with Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya*.⁴¹ P. 2.1.36 reads: *caturthī tadarthārthabalihitasukharakṣitaiḥ* "(A word ending in) the fourth case (is optionally compounded) with (semantically connected, case-inflected words signifying) 'a thing for the sake of (that meaning [403] expressed by the word in the fourth case)' and with (the semantically connected, case-inflected words) *artha* 'thing', *bali* 'food-offering', *hita* 'good', *sukha* 'pleasant' and *rakṣita* 'reserved'" (tr. Joshi, 1969: 202). Kātyāyana observes in a number of *vārttikas* that this *sūtra* covers too many cases. He proposes that the qualification *vikṛtiḥ prakṛtyā* "(a word ending in the fourth case, signifying) a product, (is compounded) with (a word signifying) the material" (tr. Joshi, 1969: 205) be added to the *sūtra*, but specifies that then the exceptions *aśvaghāsa* etc. must be mentioned (vt. 3 on P. 2.1.36: *vikṛtiḥ prakṛtyeti ced aśvaghāsādīnām upasaṃkhyānam*). That is to say, according to Kātyāyana there is a row of compounds which must be dissolved such that the first member gets a dative case-ending, even though it does not denote a product made of the material denoted by the second member. E.g., *aśvaghāsaḥ* must be dissolved *aśvāya ghāsaḥ* "fodder for a horse", according to Kātyāyana. Patañjali disagrees and states that compounds like *aśvaghāsa* are genitive compounds (Mbh. I, p. 389, l. 11-12: *aśvaghāsādayaḥ ṣaṣṭhīsamāsā bhaviṣyanti*). In view hereof we must conclude that the dissolution *dharmāya jijñāsā* of *dharmajijñāsā* in the *Mīmāṃsābhāṣya* is made in disregard of Patañjali's remark. Since Śabara knew the *Mahābhāṣya*, we are led to the conclusion that he accorded no great authority to it.

⁴¹ A translation and explanation of the Bhāṣya passage to be discussed can be found in Joshi, 1969: 202-10.

Another passage shows the limited respect in which Kātyāyana was held. On MiS 10.8.4 (IV, p. 201) Śabara concludes a discussion stating bluntly that Pāṇini speaks truth, Kātyāyana untruth⁴² (*sadvāditvāc ca pāṇiner vacanam/ asadvāditvān na kātyāyanasya/ asadvādī hi vidyamānam apy anupalabhya brūyāt*). Devasthali (1949: 239 n) rightly observes that this is “diametrically opposed to the traditional dictum ‘Yathottaram muninām Prāmāṇyam’.”

What conclusions can be drawn from the above? Very little regarding the date of composition of the *Mīmāṃsābhāṣya*. Disrespect for Patañjali and his *Mahābhāṣya* was widespread until Candra and traces of it are still found in the *Kāśikā*, as we have seen. It is more promising to see if Śabara’s disrespect for Patañjali may be an indication as to the former’s locality. We know that the concluding verses of the second Kāṇḍa of the *Vākyapadīya* strongly suggest that the disrespect for Patañjali was strongest in the south. Is it possible that Śabara lived in the south?

Some independent evidence seems to support this supposition. Śabara, like Bhartṛhari, may have been a Maitrāyaṇīya. Garge (1943; 1952: 19-22) [404] has shown that Śabara’s procedure indicates that the text of the *Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā* was most familiar to him, that he reverts to it whenever possible. If Śabara was indeed a Maitrāyaṇīya, the odds are that he lived in the area which we specified for Bhartṛhari: Gujarat or north Mahārāṣṭra. Other evidence regarding Śabara’s locality does not seem to be available (Garge, 1952: 17-18).

[407]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abhyankar, K. V. (ed.)(1967). *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha*. A collection of original works on Vyākaraṇa Paribhāṣā. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. (Post-graduate and Research Department Series, 7.)
- Aklujkar, Ashok (1978). “The concluding verses of Bhartṛhari’s Vākya-Kāṇḍa.” *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 58-59 (1977-78; Diamond Jubilee Volume), 9-26.
- Aklujkar, Ashok (1981). “Interpreting Vākyapadīya 2.486 historically (part 1).” *Adyar Library Bulletin* 44-45 (K. Kunjunni Raja Felicitation Volume), 581-601.
- Aklujkar, Ashok (1982). “Interpreting Vākyapadīya 2.486 historically (part 2).” *Indological and Buddhist Studies* (Festschrift J. W. de Jong). Canberra: Faculty of Asian Studies. Pp. 1-10.
- Aparārkadeva. *Nyāyamuktāvalī*. See under ‘Bhāsarvajña’.
- Aśvaghoṣa. *Saundarananda*. (1) Critically edited with notes by E. H. Johnston. Oxford University Press. 1928. (Panjab University Oriental Publications.) (2) Edited by Haraprasad Shastri (Re-Issue), with additions by Chintaharan Chakravarti. Calcutta: Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal. 1939. (Bibliotheca Indica, Work Number 192; Issue Number 1524 New Series.)
- Bechert, Heinz, and Simson, Georg von (eds.)(1979). *Einführung in die Indologie*. Stand - Methoden - Aufgaben. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Bhandarkar, R. G. (1873). “Reply to Professor Weber.” *Indian Antiquary* 2, 238-40.

⁴² The discussion is about vt. 2 on P. 2.1.1 (Mbh. I, p. 364, l. 1). Patañjali does not disagree with Kātyāyana.

- Bhartrhari. *Mahābhāṣyadīpikā*. Edited by K. V. Abhyankar and V. P. Limaye. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. (Post-graduate and Research Department Series, 8.)
- Bhartrhari. *Vākyapadīya*. Edited by Wilhelm Rau. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner. 1977. (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, XLII, 4.)
- Bhāsarvajña. *Nyāyasāra*. Edited, with the commentaries *Nyāyamuktāvalī* of Aparārkadeva and *Nyāyakalānidhi* of Ānandānubhavācārya, by S. Subrahmanya Sastri and V. Subrahmanya Sastri. Madras: Government Oriental Manuscripts Library. 1961.
- Bhim Sen Shastri (1979). *A Study of Nyāsa* (in Hindi: *Nyāsa-Paryālocana*). Delhi: Bhaimi Prakashan.
- Birwé, Robert (1958). "Variae lectiones in Adhyāya IV und V der Aṣṭādhyāyī." *Zeitschrift der Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 108 (Neue Folge Band 33), 133-54.
- Birwé, Robert (1961). *Der Gaṇapāṭha zu den Adhyāyas IV und V der Grammatik Pāṇinis*. Versuch einer Rekonstruktion. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- [408]
- Birwé, Robert (1966). *Studien zu Adhyāya III der Aṣṭādhyāyī Pāṇinis*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Birwé, Robert (1968). "Ist Candragomin der Verfasser der Candra-Vṛtti?" *Mélanges d'Indianisme à la mémoire de Louis Renou*. Paris: Éditions E. de Boccard. (Publications de l'Institut de Civilisation Indienne, 28.) Pp. 127-42.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes (1981a). "On some Vedic quotations in Bhartrhari's works." *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 7, 173-75.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes (1981b). "Meaning entries in Pāṇini's Dhātupāṭha." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 9, 335-57.
- Brough, John (1973). "I-ching on the Sanskrit grammarians." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 36, 248-60.
- Candra(-gomin). *Cāndravyākaraṇa*. Parts I-II. Edited by Ksitish Chandra Chatterji. Poona: Deccan College. 1953-61. (Sources of Indo-Aryan Lexicography, 13.)
- Cāndra Dhātupāṭha. See Liebich, 1902: 1*-47*.
- Cardona, George (1976). *Pāṇini: A Survey of Research*. The Hague - Paris: Mouton.
- Cardona, George (1978). "Still again on the history of the Mahābhāṣya." *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 58-59 (1977-78; Diamond Jubilee Volume), 79-99.
- Chatterji, Kshitish Chandra (1953). See: Candra, *Cāndravyākaraṇa*. Part I.
- Deussen, Paul (1920). *Die Philosophie der Upanishad's*. Allgemeine Geschichte der Philosophie, Erster Band, Zweite Abteilung. 4. Auflage. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus.
- Devasthali, G. V. (1942). "On the probable date of Śabara-svāmin." *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 23, 84-97.
- Devasthali, G. V. (1949). "Positive data for the date of Śabarāsvāmin." *Journal of the Gangānātha Jhā Research Institute* 6, 231-40.
- Devasthali, G. V. (1951). "Śabara and Patañjali." *Journal of the University of Bombay* 20 (part 2), 101-06.
- Dhātupāṭha of Pāṇini. See Katre, 1967: 57-107.
- Edgerton, Franklin (1924). "The meaning of Sāṅkhya and Yoga." *American Journal of Philology* 45, 1-46.
- Eggeling, Julius (ed.) (1874-78). *The Kātantra with the Commentary of Durgasimha*. Calcutta: Asiatic Society of Bengal. (Bibliotheca Indica, New Series, Nos. 297, 298, 308, 309, 396, 397.)
- Garbe, Richard (1896). *Sāṅkhya und Yoga*. Strassburg. (Grundriss der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde, III. Band, 4. Heft.)
- Garge, Damodar Vishnu (1943). "Did Śabara belong to the Maitrāyaṇīya school of the Yajurveda?" *Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute* 4 (1942-43), 329-39.
- Garge, Damodar Vishnu (1952). *Citations in Śabara-Bhāṣya*. Poona: Deccan College. (Deccan College Dissertation Series, 8.)
- Goldstücker, Theodor (1860). *Pāṇini: His Place in Sanskrit Literature*. First Indian edition. Edited by Surendra Nath Shastri. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Office. 1965. (Chowkhamba Sanskrit Studies, XLVIII.)
- Haradatta. *Padamañjarī*. for the edition see under 'Jinendrabuddhi'.

- Iyer, K. A. Subramania (1969). *Bhartrhari*. A study of the Vākyapadīya in the light of the ancient commentaries. Poona: Deccan College. (Deccan College Building Centenary and Silver Jubilee Series, 68.)
- Jainendra Siddhānta Kośa. By Jinendra Varṇi. 4 parts. New Delhi - Varanasi: Bharatiya Jnanapitha. 1970-73. (Jñānapīṭha Mūrtidevī Jaina Granthamālā: Sanskrit Grantha No. 38, 40, 42, 44.)
- Jinendrabuddhi. *Nyāsa*. In: *The Kāśīkāvṛtti*. Edited by Dwarika Das Shastri and Kalika Prasad Shukla. 6 Parts. Varanasi: Prachya Bharati Prakashan. 1965-67. (Prāchya Bhāratī Series, 2-7.)
- Johnston, E. H. (transl.)(1932). *The Saundarananda or Nanda the Fair*. Oxford University Press. (Panjab University Oriental Publications, 14.)
- Joshi, S. D. (1969). *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya: Avyayībhāvatatpuruṣāhnikā* [409] (P. 2.1.2 - 2.1.49). Edited with translation and explanatory notes, in collaboration with J. A. F. Roodbergen. Poona: University of Poona. (Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, Class C, No. 5.)
- Joshi, S. D. (1976). "Sanskrit grammar." In: *Ramakrishna Gopal Bhandarkar as an Indologist. A symposium*. Edited by R. N. Dandekar. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. Pp. 113-42.
- Joshi, S. D. and Roodbergen, J. A. F. (1976). *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya: Anabhihitāhnikā* (P. 2.3.1 - 2.3.17). Poona: University of Poona. (Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, Class C, No. 11.)
- Kaiyaṭa. *Mahābhāṣyapradīpa*. In: *Śrīmadbhagavatpatañjalimūnirmitaṃ Vyākaraṇamahābhāṣyam (Navāhnikam)*. Benares: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office. 1954. (Kāśī-Sanskṛta-Granthamālā, 153.)
- Kane, P. V. (1922). "Gleanings from the Bhāṣya of Śabara and the Tantravārtika." *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 26, 83-98.
- Kane, P. V. (1945). "The Mahābhāṣya and the Bhāṣya of Śabara." *Bhāratīya Vidyā* 6, 43-45.
- Kāśīkā*. A commentary on Pāṇini's grammar. 2 Parts. Edited by Aryendra Sharma, Khanderao Deshpande, D. G. Padhye. Hyderabad: Sanskrit Academy, Osmania University. 1969-70. (Sanskrit Academy Series, 17, 20.)
- Kātantra*. (1) See Liebhich, 1919. (2) See Eggeling, 1874-78.
- Katre, Sumitra Mangesh (1967). *Pāṇinian Studies. I*. Poona: Deccan College. (Deccan College Building Centenary and Silver Jubilee Series, 52.)
- Kauṇḍinya. *Pañcārthabhāṣya*. Edited, with the Pāsupata sūtras, by R. Ananthakrishna Sastri. Trivandrum: The Oriental Manuscripts Library of the University of Travancore. 1940. (Trivandrum Sanskrit Series No. CXLIII; Sri Chitrodayamanjari No. XXXII; University Series No. I.)
- Kielhorn, F. (1874a). *The Paribhāṣenduśekhara of Nāgojībhāṭṭa*. Part II. Translation and Notes. Second Edition by K. V. Abhyankar. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. 1960.
- Kielhorn, F. (1874b). "The concluding verses of the second or Vākya-Kāṇḍa of Bhartrhari's Vākyapadīya." *Indian Antiquary* 3, 285-87. Reprinted: *Kleine Schriften*. Teil I. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner. 1969. Pp. 154-56.
- Kielhorn, F. (1875). "Note on Rājatarāṅginī I, 176." *Indian Antiquary* 4, 107-08. Reprinted: *Kleine Schriften*. Teil 1, pp. 156-57.
- Kielhorn, F. (1876). "On the Mahābhāṣya." *Indian Antiquary* 5, 241-51. Reprinted: *Kleine Schriften*. Teil 1, pp. 169-79.
- Kielhorn, F. (1883). "Preface to the First Edition, Vol. II." = Pp. 11-29 of vol. III of *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya* (q.v.)
- Kielhorn, F. (1885). "Der Grammatiker Pāṇini." *Nachrichten von der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen* (1885), 185-99. Reprinted: *Kleine Schriften*. Teil 1, pp. 188-202.
- Kielhorn, F. (1886). "The Chandra-Vyakarana and the Kasika-Vritti." *Indian Antiquary* 15, 183-85. Reprinted: *Kleine Schriften*. Teil 1, pp. 244-46.
- Kielhorn, F. (1887). "Notes on the Mahabhashya. 6. The text of Panini's Sutras, as given in the Kasika-Vritti, compared with the text known to Katyayana and Patanjali." *Indian Antiquary* 16, 178-84. Reprinted: *Kleine Schriften*. Teil 1, pp. 226-32.

- Lahiri, P. C. (1935). *Concordance Panini-Patañjali (Mahābhāṣya)*. Breslau: M. & H. Marcus. (Indische Forschungen, 10.)
- Lévi, Sylvain (1890). “Notes sur l’Inde à l’époque d’Alexandre.” *Journal Asiatique*, huitième série, tome XV, pp. 234-40.
- Liebich, Bruno (ed.) (1902). *Cāndra-Vyākaraṇa*. Die Grammatik des Candragomin. Sūtra, Uṇādi, Dhātupāṭha. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus. (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, XI. Band, No. 4.)
- Liebich, Bruno (1919). *Zur Einführung in die indische einheimische Sprachwissenschaft*. [410] I. *Das Kātantra*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter’s Universitätsbuchhandlung. (Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Kl., Jahrgang 1919, 4. Abhandlung.)
- Liebich, Bruno (1928). *Konkondanz Panini-Candra*. Breslau: M. & H. Marcus. (Indische Forschungen, 6.)
- Liebich, Bruno (1930). *Kṣīratanigñī*. Breslau: M. & H. Marcus. (Indische Forschungen, 8/9.)
- Lüders, Heinrich (1930). “Kātantra und Kaumārālāta.” (*Sitzungsberichte der bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in München*, Phil.-hist. Kl. 1930, pp. 482-538.) *Philologica Indica* (Festgabe Lüders). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 1940. Pp. 659-721.
- Malalasekera, G. P. (1937). *Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names*. Vol. I. London: John Murray. (Indian Texts Series.)
- Mazumdar, Surendra Nath (1912). “A note on Kāśikā.” *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* 8, 57.
- Mīmāṃsaka, Yudhiṣṭhira (1973). *Samskṛta Vyākaraṇa-Śāstra kā Itihāsa*. Parts I-III. Sonipat: Rāma Lāl Kapūr Trust. Samvat 2030.
- Mishra, Vedpati (1970). *A Critical Study on Vyākaraṇa-Vārttika* (Hindi: *Vyākaraṇa Vārttika — Eka Samīksātmaka Adhyayana*). Varanasi: Prithivi Prakashan.
- Müller, F. Max (1880). “The Kāśikā.” *Indian Antiquary* 9, 305-08.
- Narasimhachar, Rao Bahadur R. (1916). “Madhavacharya and his younger brothers.” *Indian Antiquary* 45, 1-6 & 17-24.
- Ojihara, Yutaka (1961). “Causerie vyākaraṇique (III¹): Incohérence interne chez la Kāśikā.” *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 9, 753-749 (= (11)-(15)).
- Ojihara, Yutaka (1962). “Causerie vyākaraṇique (III²): Incohérence interne chez la Kāśikā.” *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 10, 776-766 (= (7)-(17)).
- Ojihara, Yutaka (1964). “Causerie vyākaraṇique (III³): Incohérence interne chez la Kāśikā (iii).” *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 12, 847-845 (= (13)-(15)).
- Ojihara, Yutaka (1968a). “Les discussions patañjaliennes afférentes au remaniement du *ganapāṭha*.” *Mélanges d’Indianisme à la Mémoire de Louis Renou*. Paris: Éditions E. De Boccard. (Publications de l’Institut de Civilisation indienne, 28.) Pp. 565-76.
- Ojihara, Yutaka (1968b). “Sur l’énoncé pāṇinéen *astrīviśaya* (IV. 1.63): deux interprétations et leur rapport avec le *ganapāṭha*.” *Adyar Library Bulletin* 31-32 (1967-68; Raghavan Felicitation Volume), 125-43.
- Ojihara, Yutaka (1969-70). “Les discussions patañjaliennes afférentes au remaniement du *ganapāṭha*.” *Indo-Iranian Journal* 12, 81-115.
- Palsule, Gajanan Balkrishna (1955). *A Concordance of Sanskrit Dhātupāṭhas* (with Index of meanings). Poona: Deccan College. (Deccan College Dissertation Series, 14.)
- Palsule, Gajanan Balkrishna (1961). *The Sanskrit Dhātupāṭhas*. A Critical Study. Poona: University of Poona.
- Patañjali. *Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya*. Edited by F. Kielhorn. Third Edition by K. V. Abhyankar. 3 volumes. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. 1962-72.
- Peterson, P. (1885). “Note on the date of Patañjali.” *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 16 (No. 43), 181-89.
- Pūjyapāda. *Sarvārthasiddhi*. Edited by Phoolchandra Siddhant Shastri. Delhi-Varanasi: Bhāratiya Jñānapāṭha. 1971. (Jñānapāṭha Mūrtidevī Granthamālā, Sanskrit Grantha No. 13.)
- Rau, Wilhelm (1979). “Grammatik.” = Bechert and Simson, 1979, 159-61, 118.
- Rau, Wilhelm (1980). “Bhartrhari und der Veda.” *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 5/6 (Festschrift Paul Thieme), 167-80.
- Rau, Wilhelm (1981). “Erwiderung.” *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 7, 175.

- Renou, Louis (1947). *Les Écoles Védiques et la Formation du Veda*. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.
- Rhys Davids, T. W. (1903). *Buddhist India*. London: T. Fisher Unwin. (The Story of the Nations.)
- [411]
- Roth, Rudolph (1852). *Jāśka's Nirukta sammt den Nighaṇṭavas*. Göttingen: Verlag der Dieterichschen Buchhandlung.
- Śabara. *Mīmāṃsābhāṣya*. Edited, under the title *Mīmāṃsādarśana*, by Paṇḍita Ratna Gopāla Bhaṭṭa. Benares: Harikrishna Dāsa Gupta. 1910. In 4 parts.
- Sarma, K. Mādhava Krishna (date unknown). "The text of the Aṣṭādhyāyī." *Journal of the U. P. Historical Society* 13(1), 52-65.
- Sāyaṇa. *Mādhavīyā Dhātuvṛtti*. Edited by Dwarikadas Shastri. Varanasi: Prāchya Bhārati Prakāśhana. 1964.
- Sāyaṇamādhava. *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*. Edited, with an original commentary in Sanskrit, by Vasudev Shastri Abhyankar. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. 1924. (Government Oriental Series, 1.)
- Scharfe, Hartmut (1976). "A second 'index fossil' of Sanskrit grammarians." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 96, 274-77.
- Scharfe, Hartmut (1977). *Grammatical Literature*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz. (*A History of Indian Literature*, ed. Jan Gonda, Volume V, Fasc. 2 (pp. 77-216).)
- Schroeder, Leopold von (ed.) (1881). *Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā*. Erstes Buch. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus.
- Schwartzberg, Joseph E. (ed.) (1978): *A Historical Atlas of South Asia*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press. (The Association for Asian Studies, Reference Series Number 2.)
- Sharma, Mahesh Dutt (1974). *The Kāśikāvṛtti and the Vaiyākaraṇasiddhāntakaumudī: A Comparative Study* (in Sanskrit). Poona: Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, University of Poona.
- Sharma, Peri Sarveswara (1979). "Kaiyaṭa and his work." *Bhāratīya Vidyā* 39, 5-13.
- Sharmā, Raghunātha (1968). *Ambākarī*. In: *Vākyapadīyam, Part II (Vākyakāṇḍam) with the Commentary Ambākarī*. Varanasi: Varanaseya Sanskrit Vishvaavidyalaya. (Sarasvatī Bhavana Grantha-mālā, 91.)
- Takakusu, J. (transl.) (1896). *A Record of the Buddhist Religion as practised in India and the Malay Archipelago (A.D. 671-695) by I-tsing*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Thakur, Anantalal (1961). "Cannibhatta and the authorship of the Sarvadarśanasamgraha." *Adyar Library Bulletin* 25 (Jubilee Volume 1961), 524-38.
- Thieme, Paul (1932). "Zur Geschichte der einheimischen indischen Grammatik." *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 35, 236-42. Reprinted: *Kleine Schriften*. Teil 2. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner. 1971. Pp. 524-27.
- Thieme, Paul (1956). "Pāṇini and the Pāṇinīyas." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 76, 1-23. Reprinted: *Kleine Schriften*. Teil 2. Pp. 573-95.
- Upādhyāya, Baladeva (1968). Introduction to Sharmā, 1968.
- Vyāḍi. *Paribhāṣāvṛtti*. (1) Edited by K. V. Abhyankar under the title *Paribhāṣāsūcana* = Abhyankar, 1967: 1-38. (2) Critically edited by Dominik Wujastyk. Oxford University dissertation. (Published in 1993.)
- Weber, Albrecht (1862). "Zur Frage über das Zeitalter Pāṇini's." *Indische Studien* 5, 1-176. (Reprinted: Hildesheim - New York: George Olms Verlag, 1973.)
- Wezler, Albrecht (1969). *Paribhāṣā IV, V and XV*. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der einheimischen indischen grammatischen Scholastik. Bad Homburg v.d. H. - Berlin - Zürich: Verlag Gehlen.
- Witzel, Michael (1981 f.). "Materialien zu den vedischen Schulen. I. Über die Caraka-Śākhā." *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 7, 109-132; etc.
- Yogabhāṣya. In: *Pāṭaṅjalayogadarśanam. Vācaspatimiśravīracita-Tattvavaiśārādī-Vijñānabhikṣukṛta-Yogavārttikavibhūṣita-Vyāsaśāstrīyasaṃgraha*. Edited by Nārāyaṇa Miśra. Vārāṇasī: Bhāratīya Vidyā Prakāśana. 1971.

[412]

ABBREVIATIONS

C.	Sūtra in Candra's grammar
CDhp.	Candra's Dhātupāṭha; see Liebich, 1902
D.	Bhartrhari's <i>Mahābhāṣyadīpikā</i>
Dhp.	Pāṇinian Dhātupāṭha; see Katre, 1967
Mbh.	Patañjali's <i>Mahābhāṣya</i> ; Kielhorn's edition
MiS	Mīmāṃsā-sūtra
P.	Pāṇinian sūtra
Par.	Paribhāṣā
vt.	vārttika